THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW.

Vol. IV.—OCTOBER, 1879.—No. 16.

THE CANADIAN ELEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES.

Les Canadiens del Ouest. Par Joseph Tassé. Deuxième edition. Montreal, Imprimerie Canadienne, 1878. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. xxxix., 364, 423.

Nôtre Dame des Canadiens, et les Canadiens aux Etats Unis. Par l'Abbé T. A. Chandonnet. Montreal, Desbarats, 1872. 8vo. 171 pp.

Historical Sketches of the Catholic Church in Oregon, during the past Forty Years. Most Rev. F. N. Blanchet, D.D. Portland, Oregon, 1878. 12mo. 186 pp.

AMONG the various elements that have combined to explore, occupy, and develop the vast stretch of the continent over which our flag floats is one singularly overlooked in general estimates, or simply confounded with the direct emigration from the mother country in Europe. This is the Canadian French, which really blends with our history for at least two centuries, and possesses a record to which any race might point with honest pride.

It has at last found an historian who combines extensive and accurate research with constructive ability and eloquence of description.

In the path of exploration led by Champlain and the Religious who followed the rule of the Saint of Assisi or of the grotto of Manresa, the successive generations of native-born Canadians threaded the continent in every direction, bravely bearing their part in all the enterprises called forth by discovery, trade, or war, to develop, strengthen, and defend their native colony. Under their impulse Canada or New France extended not only on French

maps, but, by military posts, missions, and agricultural settlements, as well as by the influence acquired over the Indian tribes, over most of Maine and Western New York, Western Pennsylvania, and all beyond it towards the setting sun, embracing the whole Valley of the Mississippi.

Canadians traversed this inner America "in every direction while it was yet but an immense solitude, still in its wild and primitive beauty." They were the first to cross the Rocky Mountains, and borne on by their adventurous spirit the first to thread their way from the banks of the St. Lawrence to the city of the Montezumas.

Outnumbered and lost as this pioneer element is apparently in the other elements, not even the coarse Anglo-Saxon names have been able to banish from our maps the appellations bestowed by the first Canadian explorers on river and lake, on mountain and bluff, on the desert expanse and the plunging rapid. Vermont cannot disown the sponsors who gave her the name she bears and who christened the streams that flow into the lake, or the island she claims there. New York drew her names of Chateauguay, Ausable, St. Regis, Raquette, Rouse's Point, and Chazy, from no settlers of English stock. Presque Isle, Detroit, Lake Superior, the Upper Lake from Sault Sainte Marie to Fond du Lac, Terre Haute, Des Moines, and Terre Coupée, Mauvaises Terres, with names of saints from the calendar, recall these Canadians, and even generic terms like prairie and portage and voyageur, that we have adopted into our language, do the same, as well as Indian names that in their spelling still show the source from which we derived them, like Erie, Ohio, Illinois, Iroquois, Michigan, Arkansas, Manitou, and Huron.[1]

The patron saint of the Canadian, we know not how or why, is Saint John the Baptist, and in view of the part he has played in traversing the untrod pathways of the land, the choice is not an unhappy one, for the Church in her Itinerary adopts the Precursor as the especial patron of the traveller, introducing the canticle of Zachary, taking from its last echo the antiphon and praying that "by following the exhortations of the Blessed Forerunner John we may come safe to Him whom he preached, Jesus Christ." Not without an appropriate fitness does the land of the voyageurs honor the birthday of this great saint as its patronal feast, and

[1] These names sometimes undergo strange changes. Colonel Meline tells how on his march to New Mexico he reached a stream which his guide called Picket Wire. He knew what pickets were, military and otherwise, and had some idea of the nature of wire, but he could see nothing in the country around to suggest either picket or wire. On inquiry he found that the Canadians styled this stream *Purgatoire*, out of which the American trapper had made *Picket Wire*.

Jean Baptiste designates the Canadian as Patrick does the child of Erin. "To what point of the wilderness," exclaims Father De Smet, "have not the Canadians penetrated?" and Mr. Tassé has wisely taken the words for the motto of his book.

Joliet, Canadian born, threaded the course of the Mississippi to the mouth of the Arkansas, accompanied by Father Marquette; Le Moyne d'Iberville reached the mouth of the river by sea to occupy it and plant the colony of Louisiana, which acquired strength under the guidance of his brother Bienville. Canadians accompanied La Salle to Texas; Juchereau de St. Denys founded Natchitoches, and struck through the wilderness to Spanish posts and reached the city of Mexico, The Canadian Jesuit Baudoin won over the Creeks, among whom he long preached the Gospel. Bissot de Vincennes, born on the St. Lawrence, founded the post that still bears his name, and Varenne de la Verendrye explored the Upper Missouri and the region of the Rocky Mountains to the Valley of the Saskatchewan. Forts were founded at Mackinac and Niagara by the Canadian Marquis de Vaudreuil.

Around Oswego, Niagara, Fort Duquesne, clustered more than a century ago a Canadian population. Detroit was an important settlement of Canadians before English colonization crossed the Alleghanies. Niagara, Fort St. Joseph, Kaskaskia, Mackinac, Fort Chartres, Cahokia, Carondelet, St. Genevieve, St. Philippe, Prairie du Rocher, Vincennes, Sault St. Marie, St. Louis, were all purely Canadian towns, with a regular organization, recognized in official acts, with churches, civil officers, notaries, their hardy population cultivating the soil, carrying on trade, and bravely bearing their part in the various military operations of that long and well-contested war which proved disastrous to France only because France and her profligate king were false to Canada. The most brilliant victory which in that war redeemed the glory of the French name was that won by the Canadian Chevalier de Beaujeu on the Monongahela, the dying moments of that truly Christian hero consoled by the assurance that he had nobly served his native land and that of his ancestors, by the total overthrow of the most finely appointed English army that had yet sought to wrest from France the realm acquired by her Canadian sons.

The Canadian element in Louisiana was large. The first white child born in Louisiana was that of Claude Jausset, a Canadian. Numbers reached it by the way of the Mississippi, and a considerable body of those Acadians whom England tore from their happy homes on the Bay of Fundy as "popish recusants convict" reached Louisiana by way of St. Domingo, and their descendants still form a recognized community on the Teche.

Down to 1763 the part embraced by these French settlements was recognized as Canada and Louisiana, the Illinois country and all south of it being officially part of the latter colony, though really all on the Upper Mississippi was purely Canadian. It was not merely French claim, but English admission. Documents of the last century, in Pennsylvania archives, speak of Fort Duquesne, now Pittsburg, as being in Canada.

The Canadian population thus primitively settled in the West has not vanished or become extinct. As French posts fell during the war many of the people settled near them withdrew, generally to Illinois and Detroit, and when the final overthrow came and the white flag of France was lowered at Fort Chartres by the Canadian St. Ange de Bellerive, more than half the population of Illinois, supposing that the territory west of the Mississippi was still to remain a French colony, crossed the river and founded the first settlements in Missouri, while others descended to Louisiana, but they remained within our present territory. Some discovering their error drifted back, and Illinois remained for years essentially Canadian. So little indeed did the British officers or the settlers on the coast know of the country beyond the Alleghany Mountains, where every stream and trail was familiar to Canadians, that the English force intended to occupy Fort Chartres was in the utmost perplexity how to reach its destination. To march across the unknown country between the coast and the Mississippi was utterly out of the question. Then Major Loftus with four hundred regulars attempted to reach it by way of New Orleans, but was driven back by Indians ambushed on the banks of the Mississippi. Captain Pitman tried to penetrate to it in disguise, but he lost heart and retired. Nor was Lieutenant Fraser more successful, and had to swallow as best he could the malicious condolence of French and Spanish officers at New Orleans, who heartily enjoyed the discomfiture of these English militaires seeking to lower the last French flag. It was not indeed till October, 1765, that Captain Stirling, with a hundred of the Forty-second Highlanders, after a laborious and cautious march from Fort Pitt at the head of the Ohio reached Fort Chartres, which was surrendered to him by St. Ange de Bellerive.

Guaranteed in their religious rights by the English Government, the Canadians of the Northwest resumed their peaceful avocations and became the great reliance of the English officers and trading companies in exploring further, negotiating with and managing the Indian tribes, and in developing the resources of the country. This tended to scatter them over the whole Western territory.

During our Revolutionary War this Canadian element was arrayed on different sides. The mission of the Carrolls, Franklin, and Chase to Canada attracted many to the American cause who

had never given their hearty submission to England. Volunteers enough joined the American army to form regiments, and these, after rendering good service during the contest, received, at its close, grants of land in Northern New York, where their descendants are still to be found, the nucleus of the present population of Canadian origin. The Rev. Mr. La Valiniere was so outspoken in his preferences for the Americans that he was expelled from Canada and came to New York.

Detroit was held firmly by the English, who had learned a lesson in Pontiac's War. As far as the power of British arms extended Canadian settlers and Indian tribes were employed on the side of the mother country. In Illinois and Indiana, however, the Canadians welcomed Clark, and under the lead of Rev. Mr. Gibault and Colonel Vigo threw their fortunes into the scale on the side of the Colonies and secured the Northwest to the United States. The debt the country owes these Canadians is by no means a slight one and has never been properly appreciated. In the subsequent operations a Canadian force, taking the field against the common enemy, was almost entirely annihilated.

After Spain declared war against England the Canadian colonists in Missouri had in turn to meet the hostility of the English, and the repulse of the savage foe who attempted to massacre the inhabitants of the little town of Corpus Christi is one of the most striking events in the history of the Revolutionary War.

Ducharme, the leader in this movement against an almost purely Canadian town, was himself a Canadian, and Mr. Tassé sketches his career in one of his volumes.

In this way this Canadian element in the West, which had lost its nationality as French, was scattered among the three contesting nations,—Americans, English, and Spanish,—and as it comprised a host of bold, active men, thoroughly accustomed to Indian and frontier life, this group of French Canadians contributed many who distinguished themselves in the operations of each nation, and not unfrequently Canadian was matched against Canadian.

During our second war with Great Britain there was, to some extent, a repetition of this anomalous state. Canadians on either side of the line took part in the military operations under the flag of England or of the United States, and not a few in the latter country, adhering to old associations and early allegiance, were active in British interests.

The ordinary histories of the United States ignore more or less these Canadian services to our cause, but they are none the less real and important—relatively great at the time and great in their consequences.

When peace was restored an emigration began from Canada,

which has continued, and at times attains great development. In the West the British held for years some of the posts, including Detroit, and in that way exerted an influence which led many Canadians to those parts; and the fur trade, which developed greatly after the purchase of Louisiana, excited competition between a great English trading company and a house in St. Louis, but both parties depended mainly on Canadians as voyageurs, trappers, and employés generally. These men became ultimately settlers from Green Bay to the Columbia. As the United States increased in strength and acquired the trans-Mississippi territory, offering homes and a field for labor to all, Canada, with a rapidly increasing population and fewer advantages, continued to contribute largely to the immigration. At the present time, says Mr. Tassé, "the States which contain the largest bodies of Canadians are Illinois, Missouri, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota." Missouri, founded by Canadians, has retained largely the descendants of the original stock. In Illinois the Canadian race is found chiefly at Chicago, Bourbonnais, Manteno, Petites Isles, St. Anne, Erable, Moméni, and Kankakee. There are about twenty thousand Canadians in Minnesota, and as many in Michigan. In the former State they are found chiefly at St. Paul, the Falls of St. Anthony, Little Canada, Lake Qui Parle, and Crow Wing. Monroe County, Michigan, has eight thousand Canadians, and they are numerous in St. Clair and Macomb counties. In Wisconsin this population is fully as numerous, but is much more scattered. There are also thousands of Canadians in Ohio, Iowa, Dakota, Montana, Colorado, Kansas, Arizona, New Mexico, California, Oregon, and Washington Territory.

In the East, New York and New England have received a large Canadian immigration, and in many of the manufacturing and fishing towns the French Canadians predominate, having their own churches, schools, literary and beneficial societies, as well as their papers, and show an enterprise that is highly creditable.

Little has hitherto been done for the history of this Canadian element. We trace it in the history of the fur trade, in Mackenzie's, Henry's, and Harmon's travels, in Irving's *Astoria*, in the narrative of the Canadian Gabriel Franchère, in the travels of Lewis and Clarke, Pike and Long, in Schoolcraft and Frémont; but it is only in fragments, as the voyageur appears and disappears in the course of the description.

To the Wisconsin Historical Society and the persistent energy of Hon. Lyman C. Draper in collecting the reminiscences of the early Canadian pioneers of that State, is due the credit of drawing attention in this country to the importance of this element, and a proper appreciation of it for anything like a complete history of

our country. The one-sided manner of writing our annals, which belonged to the Cotton-Mather school, and has continued to some extent to our day, of painting the early border wars as mere necessary results of an innate bloodthirstiness of the Canadians, is now relegated to the domain of fables and fairy tales.

Patent on authentic documents stands out the fact that Canada, from the first, repeatedly and persistently sought to cultivate friendly commercial relations with the English colonies, to avoid taking part in any war that might arise in Europe, and to refrain from using Indian auxiliaries in any hostilities that might be forced upon the border colonies in a way that they could not avoid.

The early New England writers, misleading and misjudging, depicted their Mason, Underhill, Church, and other Indian fighters as Christian heroes of the purest type, but portray in colors to make the blood run cold the Canadian partisans—the Hertels, Joncaires, Le Bers, St. Castins, Le Moynes—who reluctantly carried on a system of warfare forced upon them. Writers never sought to learn who and what these men were. The recent studies and publications of Canadian scholars enable us to see many of these men as they really were, and to draw real narratives of events by comparing the sometimes almost irreconcilable accounts, tinged deeply with national and religious preconceptions.

The Canadians distinguished themselves at home and abroad. We are treating of them simply in their relation to the history of the United States and its progress, but we might detail the brilliant career of the Count de Vaudreuil, who by his ability saved the French fleet from destruction off Cape Finisterre, in 1748; Baron Vaudreuil, killed at the siege of Prague; another Vaudreuil contributing to the defeat of Graves, off the Chesapeake; Beaujeus, in the fleet of D'Estaing and in Napoleon's Russian campaign; the Baron Juchereau de St. Denis, winning fame as a military engineer and writer; the Viscount de Lery, whose name is on the Arc de Triomphe at Paris.

What Ferland, Garneau, Daniel, Casgrain, Gaspé, Laverdiere did for the earlier period, the Wisconsin Society began to do for the voyageurs and pioneers of the West. A State historical society, limited in its scope, treated only of the field embraced by its territorial limits, but Mr. Joseph Tassé in his recent work, *Les Canadiens de l'Ouest*, has taken up the whole subject in a series of biographies which embrace the most distinguished of these Western pioneers. Mr. Tassé writes well, and has treated his interesting theme with skill and literary tact. We are not surprised that his work has already reached a second edition. It has all the charm of a romance, and yet he does not exaggerate. He paints his

characters to the life, avowing their faults as frankly as he describes the actions of merit. *The Canadians of the West* must, ere long, be reproduced in English, and will then find a permanent place in our historic literature, far more attractive reading to the general public than most of our local histories.

"Little has hitherto been written," says Mr. Tassé, "on the Canadians of the West. Very interesting works are not wanting on the first explorations in that vast country, or the great discoveries of the Marquettes, Joliets, and La Salles. The manners and customs of our famous voyageurs have also excited the imagination of many novelists,—among others of Cooper, Washington Irving, Jules Verne, Gustave Aimard,—but these writers, whom we may often reproach with inaccuracy, and even with injustice, have scarcely gone beyond the early period. As it always happens the most widespread renown has absorbed the public attention, throwing in the shade other personages, who are none the less important though they are less vaunted.

"Moreover the silence which envelops so many facts worthy of record, so many exciting, even heroic actions, is easily explained. To speak only of our justly renowned hunters and *coureurs de bois*, their exploits have generally been witnessed only by the wild nature around them. Ignorant of the art of writing down their recollections, when they were able to reach their firesides, after escaping a thousand dangers, their ambition aspired no further than to recount around the hearth some scene of their distant wanderings —often more wonderful than a fairy tale.

"These stories have, indeed, been handed down in a few families, where they have entered the legendary form. But how many have become so distorted that it is no longer possible to connect them with tradition. This is a matter of great regret, for what an abundant harvest might have been gathered for Canadian history, which would have been enriched with new dramas of absorbing interest. . . . . Historical societies, among whom we must place in the first rank the Historical Society of Wisconsin, have within a few years past made laudable efforts to save from oblivion many of the early Canadian pioneers of the West. The want of authentic information has hitherto prevented the historian from crowning these intrepid men, who have done such honor to the Canadian name on a foreign soil."

His two volumes are an effort to supply the want. Though he has given ten years of research, aided by the labors of friends, especially of Major Mallet, who availed himself of the immense material gathered in the Library of Congress at Washington, Mr. Tassé modestly disclaims having made a complete work. He thinks, indeed, that he has succeeded in shedding some light on

men and events who have been most unjustly forgotten. But our author is far from doing credit to his own labor and literary skill, and we must do him the justice he endeavors to do to others.

The sketches are in chronological order, or nearly so, grouping together those who as contemporaries took part in the same events. The famous Canadians of Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, Dakota, Illinois, Missouri, Texas, New Mexico, California, and Oregon are successively treated, the author concluding with the Northwest Territory and Manitoba.

The volume opens with the romantic career of Augustin Mouet de Moras, Sieur de Langlade, who married at Mackinac the sister of an Ottawa chief, and acquired great influence over the Indians of the Northwest. His son Charles led Indian bands in the wars of his time, and took a prominent part in the defeat of Braddock. He led his braves subsequently at Ticonderoga, and fought in the final battle at Quebec, where he in vain implored leave to attack Wolfe before he could form after scaling the heights. Returning to Mackinac, he saw Pontiac seize that post after in vain warning Etherington, the commandant, whom, however, he succeeded in rescuing unhurt from the hands of the savages. When the American Revolution broke out, Langlade, true to his new allegiance, took command of the Western men summoned to fight under the command of General Burgoyne. After the disaster of Bennington the Indians disbanded and Langlade returned to the West, where the fall of Vincennes made further effort useless. Father and son removed to Green Bay, where Charles de Langlade died in 1800. He had served under three flags, French, English, and American, and had taken part in ninety-nine battles and skirmishes.

"But," as Mr. Tassé justly remarks, "his reputation in the eyes of posterity will rest not on his having been an able and intrepid officer. He can claim also the less sounding but no less meritorious glory of having been one of the most intrepid pioneers of the West, one of the first to brave the dangers arising from the fierce natives of that country, by laying amid the wilderness the humble foundations of settlements now thriving and full of promise. This the American population has already recognized by bestowing upon him the glorious surname of Father of Wisconsin."

He never lost the early impression of his religious training, and to the close of his life heartily supported the clergymen, whose number was dwindling away, and endeavored, when possible, to secure their services for the little community that had grown up around him.

John Baptist Cadot was, though a less conspicuous man, the last French and first English commandant at Sault St. Marie, and for years continued to guide the community gathered there.

Very different from these was Charles Réaume, careless and reckless, failing in early life as a merchant in Canada, abandoning wife and home, captured by the Americans on the St. Lawrence, and again at Vincennes, finally settling at Green Bay, where he was appointed judge under the British régime, and continued to wear the ermine under the republican rule, administering justice for nearly thirty years. His knowledge of law, French, English, or American, was not extensive, but in such a border community much was not requisite, and the impartiality of the man and his clear insight into a case suited all who had business before the court much better. The following story is told of him by Mrs. Kinzie: "Two men one day appeared before the judge. Réaume heard patiently the very earnest complaint of the plaintiff, and the no less forcible defence of his opponent. After questioning the witnesses, Réaume rose with dignity, and pronounced the following sentence: 'You are both wrong. You, plaintiff Boisvert, must bring me a load of hay, and you, defendant Crele, bring me a load of wood. The case is settled.'"

Several other Canadian French were invested with the judicial dignity in Wisconsin in those early days, among whom Mr. Tassé mentions Joseph Rolette, James Porlier, Francis Bouthillier, Michael Brisebois, and Nicholas Boivin.

Porlier had studied for the priesthood, but left the seminary to embark for the West. He became about 1820 beyond doubt the most important man at Green Bay. His affable manners endeared him to all, and he had, before ascending the bench, rendered essential service as the first to establish a regular school. He left an unsullied name and a respected memory. He filled the positions of trust to which he was called with understanding and integrity, and the general satisfaction of the public. The better to discharge his duty as a judge he patiently translated into French the laws of Wisconsin.

The sketch of Joseph Rolette shows us another young Canadian who, laying aside his classical works and the severer studies which his father encouraged, left his home on the St. Lawrence for the great West. Although trade carried him to the soil of the United States, he was thoroughly British in his political attachments, and when the War of 1812 broke out, he entered with energy into the military operations of the West. By his advice the forts at Mackinac and Prairie du Chien were wrested from the Americans. After peace was established Rolette settled at Prairie du Chien, where a considerable Canadian population had gathered. Here he embarked in trade, and met with remarkable success, acquiring great influence over the Indians. So jealous did some become that they induced the officer commanding the fort at Prairie du Chien to banish

him to a distant island. John Jacob Astor saw Rolette's ability, and made him his agent in 1820. From that time he was one of the most prominent men of that part. His trading-boats traversed all the rivers and lakes, while he developed the resources of the town, building a saw-mill, encouraging schools, and cultivating vast tracts of land. He was liberal, generous, hospitable, always ready to relieve the poor and aid them to become self-supporting. He was made judge of the county, and took part in the Black Hawk War. Rolette was not only the most active and important trader in that part of the Northwest, but also the most enlightened and best educated man. "His society was eagerly sought by all distinguished travellers who visited Prairie du Chien, for his manners were very courteous, and his conversation very interesting, full of anecdote and wit. His prestige over the Indians only increased as years went by. He was known in every tribe from St. Louis to Lord Selkirk's colony, and from the Wisconsin to Mackinac." The Sioux called him "The King."

The Canadian colony at Prairie du Chien suffered from an unjust decision of the American authorities, by which many were deprived of lands that they had occupied and improved for years. If Rolette was one of the few whose rights were respected, he died poor in 1842, after having done more than any other man to give importance to the place.

Milwaukee, the most thriving city of Wisconsin, with its vast trade in grain, recognizes as its founder the Canadian Lawrence Solomon Juneau. He was not indeed the first settler, having been preceded as early as 1777 by Lawrence Ducharme, and at a later date by Laframboise, Chaput, Grignon, and Beaubien. But the increase of the settlement, the development of its resources, is due to Juneau, who reared his log cabin here in 1818, when the woods were beginning to assume their autumn tints. His energy, activity, and skill won him the confidence and esteem of the Indians, and his post flourished so that other settlers came. When the land was put up for sale in 1830 Juneau purchased one hundred and thirty acres on the riverside north of Milwaukee Street. A town soon started up, Juneau being the first postmaster, and ere long the first mayor. The crash of 1837 checked it, as it did many another rising town, but Milwaukee soon recovered, and kept on in healthy progress. Juneau's house was the first chapel for the Catholic inhabitants, who there gathered around the Rev. Mr. Bonduel. When in a few years he saw the city which he had founded raised by the Holy Father to an Episcopal See he gave Bishop Henni a magnificent site for his cathedral. In the same generous spirit he built a court-house on ground which he gave the city, and laid out a fine park. His liberalities and simple faith, which made him no

match for the unprincipled schemers, at last brought him to the verge of bankruptcy, and Juneau was a ruined man. He sold his property, paid his debts, and retired to Theresa, in Dodge County, where he resumed his old trading life. Still highly respected throughout the State, he was one of the delegates to the Democratic nominating convention in 1856, but he did not long survive. All who knew him loved him. The leading public men of his State expressed their admiration for his character and their regret at his loss. And the Indians, with whom he had been brought into such frequent contact, were more deeply moved than men had ever seen them. They held a council, and ordered all their braves to attend the funeral, a step till then unprecedented. He was buried on a bluff near the Indian agency, but the city which he had founded claimed his remains, and they were transferred to it, and, after a solemn requiem in the Cathedral, honorably interred.

There is no purer or more blameless character in our local history than Solomon Juneau.

In Julian Dubuque we have another of those prominent Canadian colonizers of the West; he not only founded a settlement and began to develop its mineral resources, but has been so well recognized that his name is permanently connected with it. Leaving his home at Three Rivers young Dubuque made his way to the untried West, and soon acquired importance among the Indians. Possessing great powers of sleight of hand and dexterity, he produced effects that amazed the Indians, and threw their medicine-men entirely into the shade. But when they saw him harmlessly handle the rattlesnake and other venomous reptiles, they regarded Little Night as nothing less than a supernatural being of extraordinary power. He became the judge and arbiter of all disputes.

In 1780 Peosta, wife of a Fox chief, discovered a lead mine on the west bank of the Mississippi. Dubuque at once saw the value of the discovery, and proposed to purchase it. At a great Indian Council held at Prairie du Chien, in 1788, he succeeded in obtaining from them a grant of a tract extending seven leagues along the river, and running back three leagues. They sold and abandoned it to Dubuque with full right to work the mines. Well aware that an Indian title would be very precarious, Dubuque resolved to confirm it by every legal form. The west bank of the Mississippi lay in the Province of Louisiana, then subject to the Spanish crown. In 1796 Dubuque presented to Carondelet, the Spanish governor at New Orleans, a petition soliciting a grant of the land in which the mines discovered by him were included. The governor examined the matter, and on the 20th of November, 1796, issued a grant in due form. To develop the Spanish Mine, as it was styled, Dubuque sold part of his tract to the Chouteaus of St. Louis; and when

Louisiana was transferred to the United States, he took care in Harrison's first treaty with the Sacs and Foxes to have his rights recognized by a special clause. He continued to work the mines till his death in 1811, and is spoken of as being the only man who ever induced Indians to work. They buried him with all their savage pomp on a high bluff, and for years lighted at nightfall day by day the funeral lamp at his grave, which became a kind of pilgrimage.

The Canada pioneer and miner was gone; and his rights, which he deemed so carefully guarded, were at once denied, and the United States Government, in defiance of Indian gift, Spanish grant, and American recognition, took possession of the Spanish Mine, leaving only the name of Dubuque to recall the story.

Davenport, in the same State of Iowa, recognizes as its founder the Canadian, Anthony Leclerc, who appears first at Peoria, about 1809, not long before the destruction of that place by the brutal Craig. He then retired to Rocky Island, where he settled, and where Colonel Davenport soon erected a dwelling that outshone the log cabin of the Canadian pioneer. Learned in all backwood lore, familiar with Indian thought and many of their dialects, Leclerc became important as an interpreter and agent. The Sacs and Foxes bestowed on his wife a fine tract of land, and he was more fortunate than Dubuque,—government recognized it, and Leclerc lived to see the city of Davenport grow up there, and to sell the fine house which he had erected for his residence to a railroad company, who transformed it into a station. Leclerc took an active part in all the operations with the Sacs and Foxes, and interpreted from the lips of Black Hawk the autobiography of that chief, which has been published here and in England.

He was for years postmaster and a justice of the peace, with jurisdiction in all mixed cases, where the parties contestant were white and Indian. When a Pioneer Settlers' Association was organized in 1840 he was elected its first president.

Leclerc adhered to his religion, and gave sites for Catholic churches and institutions as soon as a priest began his labors at the spot. He subscribed $2500, and actually paid a thousand more towards building St. Peter's, now St. Anthony's Church. In 1836 St. Margaret's Church was erected by him and given, with the square on which it stands, to the bishop, a donation worthy of the ages of faith.

The old Canadian town of Detroit has its worthies. In the earlier times Gouin, Navarre, Dejean, and James Duperon Baby. The last of these was a brilliant officer, fighting with his brothers at the head of detachments against the English around Fort Duquesne in 1755, and carrying the terror of the French arms into Pennsylvania and Virginia. Settling after the war at Detroit he embarked in the

fur trade, and became Indian superintendent under the British rule, to which at our Revolution he continued faithful, losing his property. His sons were not unworthy of him, and attained positions of distinction in English civil and military life.

Joseph Rainville is a kind of anomaly. Born of a Canadian father and a Sioux mother, he was educated in Canada under the care of a worthy priest, and always was and professed to be a Catholic. Those who happen to meet *Extracts from Genesis and Psalms, The Gospel according to Mark, Extracts from Matthew, Luke, and John*, in the Dakota or Sioux language, published by Protestant missionary bodies at Cincinnati, would hardly suppose that they were all translated from the French by this Catholic half-breed Rainville; yet such is the fact. His education gave him a knowledge of his own language, and long habit had so imbued him with Sioux that no interpreter in the whole West could approach him. His superiority was so indisputable that the work could not be done without his aid.

His life, however, was one of action, first as a fur trader through Minnesota, Missouri, and the Rocky Mountain district; then Captain in the English service, leading the Sioux at Fort Meigs and other fields, checking their ferocity and cruelty on many occasions, as is well substantiated. Then a half-pay officer, acting in the interests of the Hudson Bay Company; finally, in 1822, renouncing his allegiance, to settle in the United States, where, with Faribault, he founded the Columbia Fur Company, interpreter for Major Long as he had been for Pike, ever active and independent. He finally retired to Lac qui Parle to close his career. There he planted the first wheat-fields and had the earliest herds of cattle and sheep on the Upper Mississippi. His hospitality was that of a patriarch, frank, hearty, and unbounded. Rainville died in March, 1846, and was so esteemed that a county has been named after him.

Louis Provençal, another Canadian, was one of the pioneers of Minnesota, but the most prominent man in that State of the race was John Baptist Faribault, whose brother Bartholomew remaining in Canada rendered such essential service by awakening an interest in the early history of his native colony and collecting many of the rarest and most valuable works relating to it. His catalogue ranks him among our bibliographers. John Baptist, born at Berthier in 1774, attracted the attention of the Duke of Kent by his artistic skill, and received the proffer of a commission, but the service of the Northwest Company seemed to offer greater attractions. His first station was Kankakee. Here and at Baton Rouge, on the Des Moines, he made his first essays as a trader, and with singular success. Still he longed to return to Canada, but was induced to take charge at the Little Rapids. After three years at this post he married a

half-breed girl, and made the West definitively his home. When he had given ten years to the service of the Company he resolved to embark in business as an independent trader, and taking up his residence at Prairie du Chien, established a lucrative intercourse with the neighboring Winnebagoes, Sioux, and Foxes. The lead mined by his countryman Dubuque, and the furs gathered from the Indians were his chief objects of purchase, and these he transmitted by trips lasting a fortnight to St. Louis. When the war broke out between England and the United States in 1812, Faribault refused to take part against the latter. He was accordingly seized by Colonel McCall and carried on a British gunboat. Here he was ordered to take an oar, but spiritedly refused. When the British besieged Prairie du Chien his wife and children fled to Winona, unconscious that he was a prisoner in the hands of the assailants; his house was destroyed by the Winnebagoes, and his cattle and goods carried off. Everything was swept away from him, and after the labor of years he found himself utterly ruined. His courage, however, was unbroken, and he set to work to restore his fortune; but when the English withdrew they set fire to the buildings at Prairie du Chien, and left it desolate.

The Northwest Company, excluded from our territory, was forced to sell its property, and Faribault profited by the occasion. After resuming business for some years at Prairie du Chien he removed to Pike Island, near the site of the future Fort Snelling. Here he began to cultivate largely, and was the first to break ground for agricultural purposes west of the Mississippi and north of the Des Moines. The island, comprising half a square mile, was ceded to him by the Indians, and the title confirmed in a treaty in 1820. Two years later a flood swept the island, destroying all his improvements, and in 1826, owing to an accumulation of ice, the house which he had courageously rebuilt was destroyed and his cattle drowned. Leaving this exposed point he removed to Mendota, where he drove an active trade, acquiring great influence among the Indians, who called him Chapolisnitoy, or Beaver Tail, though on one occasion he was stabbed and severely injured by a lawless brave. In 1817 he met the first priest visiting those parts, and with his family profited by his ministry. In 1820 he found the Rev. M. Galtier in a dying condition at Fort Snelling, and took him to his house, where he lavished every care on him. His house became the home of the zealous priest, for whom he erected a little chapel, the first on the soil of Minnesota, where a congregation of Canadians and Indians soon gathered. This church was dedicated to the Apostle of the Gentiles, and from this fact St. Paul became the name of the new city. The venerable Vicar-General Ravoux succeeded the Abbé Galtier, and always entertained the

highest esteem for the Canadian pioneer, who died in 1860, regretted by all, after giving his children an education such as few sons of the backwoods obtain. His son Alexander became a man of influence, holding positions under the United States in Indian negotiations, and that of legislator in the State which his father aided so well to found. Minnesota has a county and a town of Faribault, and to the Catholic Church there Alexander contributed generously. He laid out Faribaultville, aided by the late General Shields.

Superior City, on Lake Superior, is another place that claims Canadian founders in the persons of John Baptist Lefebvre, Saint Denis, Roy, and Saint Jean.

St. Paul, which owes its name to a Catholic priest, Rev. M. Galtier, honors among its pioneers, the Canadian Vital Guérin, whose generosity to the city and to the Catholic Church was noble. The progress of St. Paul raised him to a position of wealth and importance, but, honest and frank himself, he was no match for the keen unprincipled knaves who swarm in a rising place. His property was swept away, and he died poor after making princely gifts and responding with prompt charity to every charitable appeal. St. Paul reared a monument to this worthy man, and the historian of the city pays the highest tribute to his worth.

Pembina claims among its pioneers Joseph Rolette, Jr., son of one whom we have already mentioned. He represented that place in the Minnesota legislature, and was a man of great enterprise. In all projects for developing the resources of the country he was one of the leaders, and his name is preserved in Rolette County, Dakota.

To an earlier period belongs John Baptist Mallet, who founded in 1777 a settlement on the site of the present Illinois town of Peoria, which was long known as Ville à Mallet. This settlement and Cahokia gave the volunteers for Brady's expedition against Fort St. Joseph, which they wrested from the English, but on the homeward march they fell into an Indian ambuscade and were nearly all killed or taken. Undeterred by this, Mallet, in 1778, marched against the same fort, captured it and carried off stores to the value of fifty thousand dollars, effectually crippling British operations in that quarter. Ville à Mallet drew to it the inhabitants of old Peoria, and prospered till 1812, when Captain Craig of the Illinois militia, whose camp had been attacked by Indians, wreaked his vengeance on the inoffensive settlers, plundering their houses, driving off their horses, and destroying their cattle and crops. They themselves were carried off as prisoners, and though set at liberty by Governor Edwards it was only to find their homes

reduced to ashes by the Indians. In vain did they appeal to Congress for indemnity; no redress was ever given.

Pierre Menard, of Kaskaskia, that old town of Canadian origin, was in the last century one of the prominent men of the West. From the year 1786 he was engaged in trade, first at Vincennes as agent for Colonel Vigo, then at Kaskaskia, and as a partner of Manuel Liza, carrying his operations to the Rocky Mountains. As agent for the United States he concluded several treaties with Indian tribes. He was elected to the legislature of the Territory of Indiana from Randolph County, and when Illinois became a Territory took his seat in the legislative council, when it met for the first time, in 1810, in the ancient town of Kaskaskia. Menard discharged the duties of president of the legislative council with calmness, moderation, and dignity. When it was admitted into the Union in 1818 Menard was elected lieutenant-governor and held the office till 1822. He died at Kaskaskia more than a score of years afterwards, universally respected and esteemed. His brother Francis, one of the earliest to run regular lines of transport down the Mississippi, was also a resident of Kaskaskia.

Colonel John Baptist Beaubien, of the Canadian stock of Detroit, was one of the first to form the settlement out of which grew the present city of Chicago, and took an active part in its early progress.

Bourbonnais, in Illinois, one of the great centres of the modern Canadian immigration into this country, regards as its founder Noel Levasseur, a native of Yamaska, Canada, who aided to transport some of the Indian tribes to the West, and was an active Indian agent in the service of the United States.

"Bourbonnais," says Mr. Tassé, "is a real Canadian village, and the traveller who alights unprepared in this spot might well imagine himself in one of the good old Canadian parishes on the St. Lawrence. The church, the college, and the convent grouped together, the houses amid their green farm lands, the frank hospitality of the people, their French gayety and accent, the old national airs that fall gratefully on his ear, the popular customs, so well, in fact, so scrupulously preserved, all remind him of Canada."

Bourbonnais is not the only recently settled spot which is in its origin as Canadian as Kaskaskia, Prairie du Rocher, Peoria, or Fort Chartres, the towns of other days, now gone or declining. Of the new series we find St. George, founded by Granger; Manteno, by Menard Martin; L'Erable, by Mrs. Kirk; St. Anne and Kankakee.

It was at Bourbonnais that the unfortunate priest Chiniquy, who had already given scandal in Canada, openly apostatized and endeavored to draw the good Canadians into his error. The man was soon rated by Protestant bodies at his real value, though they

paid dearly for the experience; and a well-known publication, not friendly to Catholics, depicted, under the title of "Aid for the Chincapins," the absurdities of this new apostate. Yet he had before his fall directed a considerable Canadian emigration from the Lower St. Lawrence to Bourbonnais, and conceived a project, which he carried out to a certain extent, of uniting all scattered Canadians in this country at that point. The body there in his time reached a population of six or seven thousand.

Joseph Robidou, son of one of the first settlers of St. Louis, planted a cabin, in 1803, at the foot of the Black Snake Hills and began to trade with the Iowas, Foxes, Pawnees, and Kansas, over whom he soon acquired great influence. Robidou's trading-house soon became well known, and having acquired by an Indian treaty with the United States a large tract to repay debts due by the tribes, he invited settlers to the spot and founded the city of St. Joseph, to which he gave the name of his patron saint, and over which he presided as its earliest magistrate.

Another of this Canadian stock, John Baptist Louis Roy, is famous in Western annals for the heroic defence made by him and his wife at Cote Sans Dessein, in 1814, against a large body of Iowas, Sacs, and Foxes. Several Canadians had been lured out by a pretended flight and then cut off. Roy, carrying his aged mother, escaped, with his wife and one companion, to their house, amid a shower of balls. Then the siege began. Mrs. Roy ran balls for the men, and when not thus employed used her own rifle with deadly aim. So rapid was their fire that they had to wet the barrels of their weapons. On the second day Roy's comrade, incautiously looking through a loophole, received a ball which stretched him on the cabin floor, mortally wounded. The Indians soon saw their advantage, and succeeded in setting fire to the roof. Roy climbed up and extinguished the flames, while his brave wife, using every loaded rifle in quick succession, kept the Indians from covering her husband with their fire-arms. The third day dragged on and they were utterly exhausted. Endurance could go no further, but they resolved to die bravely, and opened the fourth day with such a volley from different parts of the house that the Indians, with loud yells, drew off, leaving fourteen of their dead comrades around the desperately defended house.

Louis Vital Bogy, who may be considered a scion of old Kaskaskia, who became Commissioner of Indian Affairs under President Johnson, and who died United States Senator from Missouri, is one of the most distinguished men of this French Canadian element. His education was traversed by an accident which compelled him to limp for many a long day on crutches. Yet with all this drawback he began to study law in 1812, declaring even

then, in a letter to his mother, that the aim of his life was to represent Missouri in the United States Senate, and that he was determined to do so if he had to labor for it till he reached the age of sixty. After studying law and completing his classical studies at Kaskaskia he returned to St. Genevieve, where he purchased a fine property and entered into public life. In 1852 he ran for member of Congress against Thomas H. Benton, and the old statesman secured his return with difficulty, Bogy having carried all the counties except that in which St. Louis was situated. Thus brought prominently to the front, Bogy was soon elected to the Missouri legislature.

He purchased, with others, the Pilot Knob, an iron mountain, and established the Iron Mountain Railway, in order to bring the ore to market. His profession was never laid aside. While engaged in politics and public works of the kind he retained a large practice till the commencement of the civil war, when he was excluded by the oath which fanatics imposed on that State. He ran for Congress in 1863 against Blair, but the terrorism employed defeated him. Three years subsequently he was, as already mentioned, appointed Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and in 1873 was elected to the Senate of the United States, thus attaining the goal which his boyish ambition had fixed.

As Indian Commissioner he redressed some of the chronic injustice of that bureau to the Catholic missions, and in the Senate he was never afraid to avow his Catholicity, his defence of Catholic loyalty against the shameless assault of Senator Edmunds having been clear and noble.

The names we have hitherto cited refer chiefly to the Northwest, but Michael Branamour Ménard, nephew of the lieutenant-governor of Illinois of that name, is one of the heroes of Texan history. He went to Texas in 1829, and as a trader became so influential with whites and Indians that at the period of the revolt from Mexico the new government relied upon Ménard to secure the friendship, or at least neutrality, of the Indian tribes. He was a member of the Constitutional Convention and on the organization of the republic was elected to Congress.

F. X. Aubrey, an adventurous traveller, brilliant in his descriptions, organized an extensive overland trade with New Mexico. His life teems with stirring adventures and perils amid the wild Indians of the plains, but he escaped them all, to be finally assassinated by Major Weightman.

On the same ground the Canadian Leroux acquired no little reputation. California has an energetic Canadian, Prudent Beaudry, who has labored to develop its resources, especially in and around Los Angeles.

When we reach Oregon, first colonized at Wallamette and Cowlitz by Canadians of the Hudson Bay Company, we find among the earliest pioneers Gabriel Franchère, who went out in Mr. Astor's interest in 1810, and reached the Columbia in the following year. Franchère has given, in a volume issued both in French and English, the history of Astoria, and was for many years honored among the merchants of New York, where he lived to the advanced age of seventy-nine. Peter Pambrun and Joseph Larocque also figure among the eminent Canadian pioneers of Oregon.

The Most Reverend Francis Norbert Blanchet, Archbishop of Oregon, and his brother, Bishop of Nesqualy, Vicar-General Brouillet, and other clergymen who labored with them in Oregon, are also Canadian pioneers, who are not to be overlooked in the immense good which they accomplished.

In the *Historical Sketches of the Catholic Church in Oregon*, which we believe we may, without error, ascribe to the venerable Archbishop of Oregon, we trace the Canadian settlers in that State and the adjacent territory, their industry and courage, as well as the fidelity to religion which induced the pioneers to send to St. Boniface to implore a priest from Bishop Provencher, when that apostolic man could only refer them to Quebec. The Rev. Mr. Blanchet responded to that call. As pioneer priest he gathered those distant Canadian settlers around the altar, saying Mass for the first time in Oregon on October 14th, 1838. Peter Chrysologne Pambrun, a pioneer at Fort Wallawalla, Joseph Gervais, Etienne Lucier, Pierre Belegue, at Fort Vancouver, and Simon Plamondon, at Cowlitz, welcomed the priest, and their houses were the first chapels; and many who had been settled in the country from ten to twenty years at last had the consolation of hearing Mass and approaching the Sacraments.

These sketches show us much of the life of the Canadian pioneers of Oregon, and of the progress of religion among them from that time, and their part in building up the national prosperity on the Pacific coast.

E. N. Quimette is now Mayor of Olympia, Capital of Washington Territory. Joseph Perreault is Territorial Superintendent of Public Instruction of Idaho, and there are numerous aldermen, sheriffs, etc., etc. Nearly all the Canadians in the United States are American citizens, except the mill operatives in the New England towns.

The biographical sketches of Mr. Tassé thus cover only the West, but the Canadian element, as we have seen, is not confined to the new States and Territories. There has been a considerable increase within the last ten years, but we find in the census of 1870, 493,464 given as the number of natives of British America in

the United States. The returns do not distinguish the French Canadians from the others, but the mass of these immigrants belong to the latter class, and many of them are undoubtedly recorded as French, and in this way not included at all. The French Canadians must constitute one-tenth of the whole foreign population of the United States. The greatest number, 89,590, appears in Michigan, forming 8 per cent. of the population; New York has 79,000; Massachusetts, 70,000, 5 per cent. of the population of that old colony of Puritans and Separatists. Illinois stands next, with 32,000. Vermont, with 28,000, a larger relative proportion than any other State; Wisconsin has 25,000, while Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, California, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Ohio, Minnesota, and Iowa range from 10,000 to 17,000.

The number of Canadians who emigrated between 1840 and 1850 was 30,000; this emigration followed immediately after the Patriot War of 1837.

Mr. Gagnon, editor of *Le Travailleur*, and other gentlemen, who organized the great festival of Montreal of 1874, the object of which was to organize a movement of repatriation, assert that there are 550,000 Canadians (and children of Canadians who have retained their language, traditions, etc.) in the United States.

Forty thousand Canadians served in the Union army during the War of the Rebellion; about ten entered the Southern army as officers.

This population was almost exclusively Catholic, and, exposed to the sneers and attacks prompted by ignorant bigotry, many became ashamed or indifferent to their religion, especially where they found churches already overcrowded, and the instructions given in a language unfamiliar to them. They missed, too, some of the ceremonies to which they had been accustomed, and did not feel at home. They needed churches of their own, and these they have now erected in various parts where the numbers justified the step, and Canadian priests, trained as many of our own priests have been for years in the Grand Séminaire founded at Quebec by Laval, or at Montreal by the sons of Olier, are laboring among their countrymen in various parts of the United States. They have schools and academies directed by communities, filiations of Canadian bodies, or connected with them. The Clercs de St. Viateur have a college at Bourbonnais; the Jesuits in the State of New York; the Priests of the Holy Cross in Indiana; the Oblate Fathers are connected with Canada, and number many Religious born or educated in that ancient Catholic province. The Sisters of Charity, founded by Madame d'Youville at Montreal, and commonly called Gray Nuns, have among other places houses in Salem and Lawrence, Mass., Ogdensburg and Plattsburg, N. Y., St. Johnsbury, Vt., and an In-

dian mission at Devil's Lake, Dakota. The Sisters of the Congregation of Our Lady, founded at Montreal by the Ven. Margaret Bourgeoys, the process of whose canonization is now actively pursued, have houses at Bourbonnais and Kankakee, Illinois. The Sisters of Providence, of Montreal, have hospitals at Fort Vancouver, Portland, and Seattle, and Indian schools at Fort Vancouver, Fort Colville, Tulalip, and elsewhere. The Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary are found in Vermont and in Florida. The Ursuline Convent of Quebec, founded by the Ven. Mother Mary of the Incarnation, whom we may hope to see soon beatified, has sent members of its ancient community to Louisiana and Texas.

All these bodies give material to complete the picture of what Canadians have done and are doing for the religious and moral as well as the material progress of the country.

The Abbé Chandonnet gives the history of one of these churches in his work, *Nôtre Dame des Canadiens, et les Canadiens aux Etats Unis.* It is a larger work than has yet been devoted to the history of any single Catholic Church in this country, and not only gives the story of the Church of Our Lady of the Canadians at Worcester, Massachusetts, from the earliest effort, by Rev. Mr. Levesque, in 1846, till the successful ministry of Rev. Mr. Primeau, and all he effected, but enters at some length into the various questions concerning this Canadian emigration to the United States and its influence on both countries. We trace the church, beginning in a hired hall, the zealous priest collecting, purchasing a Protestant church, organizing schools, societies, etc., holding fairs, nobly sending a part of the receipts to the beloved Pius IX. and prostrate France. The life of the church, with its struggles of erection and maintenance, is a picture not unfamiliar to us, but as here depicted we enter into the life of the French Canadian colony in New England. Religion is saving these immigrants for Canada and for the United States. In our rougher masses they are exposed to dangers menacing their faith and morals, but the best periodicals of New England recognize the morality of the Canadian factory girl as superior to that of the American, obedience and family ties exercising greater sway.

Not only by their own clergy and religious communities have the Canadians endeavored to preserve their identity, but also by the great modern power, the Press. Among the newspapers of Old Massachusetts are *Le Protecteur Canadien*, *Le Jean Baptiste*, *Le Travailleur.* New York has *La Patrie Nouvelle;* Rhode Island, *Le Courrier Canadien;* Minnesota, *Le Canadien* and *Le Franco-Canadien;* Illinois, *Le Courrier de l'Illinois;* proving that the Canadian element consists of a reading people, and showing energy and activity on their part in meeting the wants of their new position.

To the many ignorant folk of our land who imagine that the Canadians speak a patois unrecognizable by the ear or eye of a Frenchman, it will perhaps be news that the articles in these papers are written with great purity of style and remarkable eloquence and power.

Mr. Tassé, limiting himself to the West, leaves Louisiana untouched; and in that State the Canadian element and the French are so intimately blended that it would be no easy task to trace each separately. Its early founders and governors, d'Iberville, de Bienville, La Motte Cadillac, were Canadians, or long identified with Canada.

Many American officers married into Canadian families in the West and South, and their descendants with English names still pride themselves on the Canadian French stock from which they spring. General Macomb, of the United States Army, was descended through his mother from the Navarres of Detroit. Commodore Barrett, of the navy, claims descent from the family of Jumonville, the Canadian officer killed by Washington on the Ohio.

Canadian blood thus runs through the whole community; and as the immigration from the neighboring Dominion is likely to continue, this element must rise in importance. The last century has wrought many changes, but perhaps in them all none is stranger than the influence of Canada on the United States. Providence seems almost in mockery to have made human schemes and designs result in the very reverse of what men aimed at and strove to accomplish. From the closing decade of the seventeenth century the American Colonies and especially New England strove with all the fury of fanatic zeal to crush Canada. Expeditions went forth headed by ministers, who bore an axe with which to demolish every representation of "Jesus Christ and Him crucified" that they could find in the Catholic churches of the French province. The outrages they did commit in cold blood in edifices set apart for divine worship, and which in all international law are respected, are matter of record, and excited then, as they excite now, the reprobation of all sound thinkers. Canada fell at last, weak as she was, not that she did not struggle bravely, but that her vile king abandoned her. Then Providence arrested what seemed inevitable. Catholicity was not overthrown. Canada remained true to the faith, and has remained so to this day. The Colonies in their wrath made this one of the great wrongs for which they raised the standard of revolt. They began the Revolution as ultra Protestants, but requiring aid, put their ultra Protestantism aside to talk the language of liberality and toleration in the presence of the envoys, the army, and navy of Catholic France. The new governments and the new central government have been steadily tending to the point where

the State does violence to the convictions of no man, woman, or child, and enforces no State religious doctrines or systems or standpoints on the citizen.

Meanwhile Catholic Canada is sending her Catholic sons, her priests, her devoted Sisterhoods into this country. New England, which sought with such rabid hate to crush Canada and Canadian Catholicity, now sees her towns swarm with Canadian Catholics, with churches and convents. Did the early Cottons, and Mathers, and Endicotts, and Winthrops ever dream of such a result? Did they foresee that when their stern unchristian Calvinism had given place to Unitarianism there would be seventy thousand Canadian Catholics in Massachusetts, thirteen thousand in New Hampshire, more than twice as many in the New Hampshire Grants, ten thousand in Rhode Island, and as many in Connecticut, and twenty-six thousand in the district of Maine, living their Canadian life, with church, and priest, and nun, reproducing that hated province on that New England soil which they sought to separate by a wall of fire from all dissent? Catholics of other lands there would be in their eyes bad enough; the despised Irish Catholics bad, very bad; Catholics of New England lineage, and many there be, horrible enough; but nothing, we think, would have curdled the blood of those New England worthies of the early part of last century more than the mere suggestion of the possibility that the day would come when one hundred and fifty thousand Canadian Catholics would quietly seat themselves on the sacred soil of New England!

MODERN AND ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY COMPARED.

Die Philosophie der Vorzeit, vertheidigt von Joseph Kleutgen, S.J., 2 Bände, Münster, 1860.

Dr. Th. A. Rixner's Handbuch der Geschichte der Philosophie, III. Band, Sulzbach, 1850.

Lehrbuch der Geschichte der Philosophie von Dr. Albert Stöckl, Zweite Auflage, Mainz, 1875.

CATHOLIC philosophy has during the past twenty years more and more returned to the scholastic system. The tenets of the great doctors of the Middle Ages have been expounded and defended in several scientific works; their method has been reintroduced into our institutions and universities; their principles have been again considered as the firm basis of truth. Not only learned men have employed the strength of their intellects, but also the Roman pontiffs have made use of their authority to revive the esteem of scholastic philosophy and to reinstate it in its old domain, the Catholic schools. Pius IX., having condemned many errors which resulted directly from modern systems, and defined several points of Catholic doctrine just as they were taught by the ancient scholastics, declared at last solemnly in the Syllabus (Prop. XIII.), that scholastic theology, and consequently also its foundation, scholastic philosophy, both answers the wants and agrees with the scientific progress of our time. In these days our glorious pontiff, Leo XIII., insists on a still more complete adoption of the tenets of Thomas Aquinas as a principal remedy for the many evils of human society.

But must the return to scholastic philosophy not expose the Catholic schools to the raillery of infidels and generally of those outside the Church? There is no doubt that our age has far surpassed former centuries in the natural sciences. Shall we, then, say that mental philosophy alone has made no progress, and implicitly return to the system of ages decried for their darkness? To prevent or to reject such charges it will be necessary to contrast modern with ancient philosophy. By such comparison we shall discover whether modern has won over ancient philosophy such advantages as ought not to be given up, or has, on the contrary, set forth doctrines which right reason is compelled to object against on account of the false principles they suppose, or the baneful consequences they imply. If the latter is the case, who will blame us for the preference we give to scholastic philosophy?

Modern philosophy is thought by its admirers to have surpassed the ancient systems chiefly in unity. The human mind has never

acquiesced in science not reduced to unity, which is, both in the real and in the ideal order, the last perfection of things. But though this tendency toward unity may be remarked in all scientific researches even from the remotest antiquity, it is, nevertheless, peculiar to philosophy. As this searches into the last and general reasons of things and thus furnishes the full understanding of the principles from which all other sciences start, it is, in the natural order, the science of sciences, and for this very reason takes the leading part in the struggle for unity. Now philosophy, it has frequently been said, should for the sake of unity draw all its conclusions from one first principle by strict deduction; then refer all objects known to one first and absolute being; and at last unfold the connection between the subject thinking and the object thought of. It has often been added that scholastic philosophy has failed in all these respects, since it neither arrived at strict conclusions from one supreme principle, its tenets being but dogmas to be admitted by blind faith; nor joined things known together in intrinsic unity; nor accounted for the transition from the subject to the object. Modern thinkers, on the contrary, are highly praised for having, first and alone, reduced philosophy to one harmonious system perfect in every regard.

All unity of modern philosophy results from idealism, which makes self the centre of all, the source of both cognitions and things. Of it, however, we must distinguish three different stages. First, the way to idealism was prepared by a new speculation, opposed to antiquity; then idealism itself was set forth as a complete system by Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel; at last, idealism being rejected as a whole, some of its principles and presuppositions were taken as a basis of several modern schools spreading their teachings over the earth in our days. In this essay we shall not speak but of idealism in its strict and proper sense and of those systems giving rise to it.

First we shall expound the doctrine of idealists and their forerunners, and then criticize them as to unity.

As the very marrow of idealism lies in deriving all from, and reducing all to self, all those systems must be considered as leading to it, which follow a subjective tendency. Now this course of philosophizing is, not without reason, said to have originated with René des Cartes (born at La Haye, in France, in 1596; died at Stockholm in 1650). Of his system, then, we have first to speak. He intended to build up philosophy on a more solid foundation than the scholastics had laid, whom he thought to have based their reasoning on principles not certain at all. He takes his point of departure in universal doubt. "Everybody," said he, "should, once in his life, doubt all things and not admit anything to be

but what cannot be doubted or denied by anybody and thence must be immediately certain." Now, according to his views, we can, for good reasons, doubt the truth of mathematical demonstrations, the very first principles of reasoning, the existence of the world, and even of our own body; because a bad genius may impose them on us by falsifying our cognoscitive powers. Only one thing, the existence of our mind, he thought impossible to be doubted or denied; since without existing we could not even think or doubt. Starting from this one fact as undoubtedly certain he tried to reconstruct the certainty of our cognitions, both intellectual and sensual, by the following course of reasoning. Of our own existence we are perfectly certain, because we perceive it clearly and distinctly. From this we must deduce as the first criterion of all certainty the principle: All is certainly true that we perceive clearly and distinctly. When, now, the mind further reflects on itself, it becomes conscious of its being immaterial, but finite. The idea of the finite presupposes that of the infinite, which cannot be acquired by our reason, since the finite cannot produce the infinite, which must be inborn in it and stamped on it by an infinite power. Consequently, God, the infinite being, exists; for he could not bring forth this idea in our mind without existing, and moreover, the very conception of the infinite implies existence. Now, as God, on account of his infinite perfection, is truth itself, our cognoscitive powers too, having proceeded from him and bearing his likeness, cannot but be true. Thus he arrived at the truth of our senses and our intellect, and infers from it, that whatsoever they clearly and distinctly represent must be also true: viz., the principles of reasoning, the existence of both our body and the material world without us.

On this foundation and from the principles thus established he drew conclusions and developed a philosophical system, which, we cannot deny, were frequently opposed to the tenets of the scholastics and akin to modern theories. He, for instance, defines substance to be a thing which, as to its existence, is in no need of any other being; he places the essence of the soul in thought, and that of the body in extension; he makes the metaphysical truth as well as the existence of finite beings dependent on the free will of God, and consequently maintains that we cannot ascertain by ourselves the final causes of the world; he does not ascribe any action to matter and thinks it to be only an occasion for the exertion of divine activity; he thinks the body to be the prison of the soul, which thus cannot directly perceive the outside world, but only the impressions made on the senses from without. But notwithstanding these novelties introduced by him into Christian philosophy,

the idealists have no reason at all to be pleased with his theories; for he not only admitted the existence of a personal God distinct from the world, but also highly esteemed supernatural faith, of which he would not allow the least doubt. His merits, then, as far as idealism is concerned, consist only in having pointed out self as the starting-point of solid, unprejudiced philosophy, and in having first raised the standard of opposition against the scholastics.[1]

Further steps had therefore to be made in the direction of subjective tendency and were made indeed by Immanuel Kant (born at Kœnigsberg, in 1724, died there in 1804). Dissatisfied with Berkley's skepticism as well as Leibnitz's dogmatism, based on Des Cartes' system, he endeavored to arrive at truth by a middle way. He would neither say with Berkley that objects without us had no reality at all and were merely fictions of our mind, nor admit with Leibnitz and the ancients[2] that our reasoning was conformable to objects as they are in themselves. To evidence truth lying between skepticism and dogmatism, he built up a philosophical system consisting in the criticism of our cognoscitive powers. The criticism of the senses, by which we form perceptions, he called transcendental æsthetics; the criticism of understanding, by which we form judgments and notions, transcendental analytics; the criticism of reason, by which we draw conclusions and form ideas, trancendental dialectics or metaphysics. As reason regards theoretical and practical truths, metaphysics is subdivided into the criticism of the pure, and into that of the practical reason. All these criticisms he published successively in several works; his system, however, is laid down chiefly in the *Criticism of Pure Reason*, published at Riga in 1781 and 1787.

Kant grants that there is an object outside us or a thing in itself, which by acting on us furnishes the matter of our perceptions. But the senses can perceive the object only by certain forms innate in their very nature; they, consequently, give the form of our perceptions. This, therefore, originates within us and results by no means from outside things, though it appears to be in them and to make an impression on us; just as to those who look through green spectacles everything seems to be green. There are two forms of this kind in our senses: space, by which we perceive things one

---

[1] Des Cartes expounds his system chiefly in the following works: Meditationes de prima Philosophia, Paris, 1641, Amstelod., 1644; Principia Philosophiæ, Amst., 1644. Meditationes de Methodo, contained in the work: Specimina philosophica, Lugdun. Bat., 1644.

[2] Kant and the idealists were not acquainted with scholastic philosophy itself; they knew Leibnitz and Wolf, and the scholastics only as far as contained in them. For this reason they charged them all indifferently with dogmatism.

with the other, and time, by which we perceive them one after the other. Space and time, therefore, have no reality in the things themselves, but are merely the framework of our senses, projected on the objects perceived and reflected from them. What the object is outside us in itself, we cannot know, since it never appears to us in its own form, but only under that of our senses. For this reason Kant styles it transcendent, that is, beyond our experience, or the unknowable Æ.

Our senses having formed perceptions, the understanding, to reduce them to order, begins to judge of them. Now just as the senses cannot perceive the outward object, so the understanding cannot judge of the perceptions but by certain inborn forms or modes, which, as judging rests on perceiving, are founded on space and time. Judgment has twelve modes, for its needs are determined as to quantity, quality, relation, and modality. As to quantity it is universal, particular, or singular; as to quality it is affirmative, negative, or indefinite; as to relation, it is categorical, hypothetical, or disjunctive; as to modality, it is problematical, assertory, or apodictic. These subjective forms are again projected on the object judged of, as the forms of perception are reflected from the object perceived. Thus all objects appear to us under twelve forms; under that of unity, plurality, or totality as to quantity; of reality, negation, or limitation as to quality; of substance, cause, or reciprocity as to relations; of possibility, necessity, or existence as to modality, each one resulting from a respective mode of judgment.[1] Being respects, under which all things are reduced to unity, they are also termed notions or categories of the understanding. Kant thinks to have thus proved that judgments in which time, space,

[1] The following table illustrates under what form each mode of judgment makes the object appear:

	Forms	
	Of the Judgment or Understanding.	Of the Object.
I. Quantity.	Universal,	Unity.
	Particular,	Plurality.
	Singular,	Totality.
II. Quality.	Affirmative,	Reality.
	Negative,	Negation.
	Indefinite,	Limitation.
III. Relation.	Categorical,	Substance.
	Hypothetical,	Cause.
	Disjunctive,	Reciprocity.
IV. Modality.	Problematical,	Possibility.
	Assertory,	Necessity.
	Apodictic,	Existence.

or one of the twelve notions or notes deduced from them are predicated of a subject, must be termed "synthetical *a priori*;" synthetical, because we extend our perceptions by them; *a priori*, because the predicate or the form attributed pre-exists in our mind before all experience.[1]

Again, as understanding puts order in our perceptions by judging, so reason reduces our judgments to unity by conclusions; and as understanding judges by twelve innate modes, so reason draws conclusions by the three inborn forms of the categorical, the hypothetical, and the disjunctive syllogism. By them reason views things under the relation of inherence, dependence, and coherence. Inherence presupposes a last and absolute substance in which things inhere; dependence a last and absolute cause on which they depend; coherence a last and absolute whole to which they belong as parts and in which they are referred to one another. All things are comprised in these three ideas and reduced by them to unity. The absolute substance is the soul, the object of Psychology; the absolute cause is God, the object of Theology; the absolute whole is the world, the object of Cosmology. It is quite consequent that in Kant's system God, the soul, the world have no reality but in our mind, as far as they are implied in its innate forms of reasoning as the end at which they aim. Outside our mind, in themselves they are unreal. The appearance which they have is, as he plainly says, a necessary illusion, a sophism, a reflection of the framework of our mind, a product of our reason. This criticism of the theoretical reason, which, as it is independent of any outward object, he calls pure, constitutes Kant's Metaphysics or Transcendental Dialectics.[2]

---

[1] From this definition it is evident that Kant speaks of synthetical and *a priori* judgments in a quite peculiar sense, not like other philosophers. He admits a judgment only then to be analytical, if the predicate is *formally* contained in the conception of the subject; and terms the judgment, the predicate of which is *virtually* contained in the conception of the subject, synthetical. For this reason he thinks mathematical demonstrations to be synthetical, not analytical. But generally those judgments are called synthetical, the predicate of which is not contained at all in the conception of the subject, and those analytical the predicate of which is ether formally or virtually contained in the conception of the subject. Again, according to common definition that judgment is *a priori* in which the connection between subject and predicate is known from their very essence; and that *a posteriori* in which the connection between subject and predicate is known, not from their essence, but from the experience of their effects. As now Kant himself says that space, time, and the other notes mentioned are necessarily contained in the conceptions we form of things, and as moreover the form of our cognitions is, not inborn in the mind, but received from the object, as we shall prove afterwards, it is evident that there are no such synthetical judgments *a priori*.

[2] Transcendental Kant terms: first, any state or quality of the mind respecting the transcendent; secondly, the forms and ideas which pre-exist in the mind independent of experience; thirdly, the inquiry about the forms of the mind.

Lastly Kant criticizes the practical reason which has to put order in our actions as the theoretical reason has to reduce our thoughts to unity. Reason regulates our actions by dictating to us the moral law. In this Kant distinguishes a material and a formal principle. The material principle of the law is the good to be done or the order to be put into reality. Good is not contained in the nature of our reason, but allures our will from without and is brought into connection with it by the understanding; for this not only conceives the order which it necessarily produces itself, but, in accordance to it, also devises what our will freely realizes in nature, thus connecting the theoretical and the practical reason, and establishing analogy between nature and morality. The formal principle of the moral is the necessity which it lays on us to do good or to put order into reality by our will. It does not actuate us from without, but lies within the very nature of our will, just as the forms of judging and reasoning are inborn in our mind, and not brought into it from without. Both principles are maxims of our actions; but as good regards our self-love, it varies in each individual, and is, for this reason, changeable and particular, implying at most hypothetical necessity. The formal principle, on the contrary, being in the nature of reason itself, is common to all men, invariable, and binding absolutely. From this difference of the two principles the following formula may be deduced as the supreme moral law: "Act only on such a maxim as may also be the principle of a universal law."

Since pure necessity is the formal principle of the moral law, it it also the formal cause of morality. A moral action, then, must be determined by its necessity, and by no means by the regard to any good to be obtained. Whatsoever proceeds from this necessity is moral; whatsoever flows from another source, however so much productive of good, is not moral. The motive, therefore, of a moral action cannot be fear or love of a being distinct from us, but ought to be respect for the law inborn in our nature. From this character of the moral law Kant draws two conclusions: first, that man in regard to morality is autonomous, that is, a law unto himself, and subject to no outward lawgiver, not even to God; secondly, that, as the sensual nature revolts against the rational, to which it ought to be subordinate, the law of reason is in regard to sensual appetite a categorical command or imperative. But though our will must be actuated by the respect for the moral law as its proper motive, it, nevertheless, cannot act without the highest good as its last object; for as there cannot be an action without an object, so there is no other object for the will than good. We must infer from this that the moral law binds us to tend toward the highest good, so, however, that this is not the cause, but the effect of our actions.

Searching into the nature of the supreme good, Kant thinks it to consist in virtue and happiness; the former being the cause of the latter, and both together accomplishing the harmony between nature and morality.

The necessity of the moral law moreover implies as presuppositions the freedom of the will, the immortality of the soul, and the existence of God. The freedom of the will Kant does not place in the power to act or not to act, to choose this or that object, but in the exemption from outward compulsion. It is clear that morality which consists in self-determination presupposes such freedom, for self-determination and compulsion are incompatible. The immortality of the soul he thinks to be a condition of morality, because this cannot be obtained but by an indefinite progress, which again prerequires an endless existence of the soul progressing. The existence of God is presupposed to the moral order for the following reason: In this world sensual nature cannot be fully subjected to reason, nor is happinsss enjoyed in proportion to virtue. But as, nevertheless, it ought to be so, there must be an intelligent cause which will once reduce nature to perfect harmony with morality and thus realize our happiness. This intelligent cause we call God. Therefore these presuppositions do not rest on any objective ground which theoretical reason may attain, either directly or by the way of conclusion, but are simply founded on the practical reason by the subjective necessity of the moral law on the one side and the utter impossibility to comply with it on the other, such conditions not being fulfilled. We have, therefore, either to assume them or to despair of morality. This being the basis on which they rest, they are simply postulates of the practical reason, admitted not by science, but by faith.

From the existence of God religion is deduced. If God by his interference puts full harmony between virtue and nature, He undoubtedly also intends and orders our happiness. The moral law, therefore, compels us to consider ourselves bound by Him to strive for happiness. Now religion is the tendency towards the highest good or happiness so far as this is enjoined on us by God. It is, consequently, not the source, but the consequence of morality, not a manifestation, but merely a support of the moral order; it is like the existence of God on which it is based, not a truth attainable by science, but a presupposition forced on us and assumed by faith. Having given this definition of religion Kant tries to show that all the mysteries of Christianity are nothing but symbolical expressions and personifications of the ideas and tenets laid down in this system of morality.

It has always been agreed that the result of Kant's critical researches was merely negative. Philosophy had been reduced by

him to Dialectics; of Metaphysics all objects were denied; any knowledge of things in themselves was declared to be utterly impossible. Kant had destroyed everything and built up nothing. But what is still worse, he has fallen just into those errors which he pretended to have overcome by his criticism. He first intended to refute skepticism, and establishes it in its most outspoken form. How could we rely on our cognitions with certainty if all things outside us are absolutely unknowable, and if any determinate form of an object appearing is a mere illusion? What, moreover, has become of the objective order itself according to his views? True, he admits a thing in itself, but he deprives it of possibility as well as necessity, of plurality and unity, of reality and negation, of cause and substance, of time, space, and existence; since all that is not real in the object, but an appearance produced by our mind. What then is still left of the thing in itself? Certainty has vanished away from his system; because there is neither an object outside us, which we may know, nor a power within us by which we may know it. He also tried to overcome dogmatism, but nobody has ever relied on faith so blindly as he. The truths he saved he admitted as postulates on no objective ground or scientific demonstration, but on account of a mere subjective want of the mind, the faculties of which were already undermined by his criticism of pure reason. Notwithstanding these lacks Kant's theories are the real foundation of idealism. Having broken up all connection with antiquity, he constructed a quite new system of philosophy, the seeming solidity and consistency of which roused the minds of his age to enthusiasm for modern speculation. By him first reason was declared to be absolute, being as to the form of its cognition independent of any outward object, and producing by itself the physical as well as the moral order of the world. Nobody will deny that therein lies the germ of idealism. This he even formally developed, when, endeavoring to accomplish the unity of his system, he guessed that all objects, the mind as well as the outward world opposed to it, since they belong to the same whole of experience, might be twofold phenomena or products of one and the selfsame thing in itself.

John Gottlieb Fichte (born at Romenau in Lusatia in 1762, died in Berlin in 1814) took up and unfolded this idea. He, then, admitted only one thing existing, which had both a subjective and an objective appearance, that is, which developed itself both in thought and in nature. Accordingly he attributed the same entity to the real and the ideal, to the subject thinking and the object thought of. By this identity of thinking and being he imagined he had overcome skepticism, since nature was thus no longer a mere illusion as in Berkeley's and Kant's system, but had reality, though

none distinct from ourselves; and had thus reached, not dogmatism or blind faith, but true science, which derived all things from their last source and reduced them again to absolute unity.

But by what reason does Fichte uphold the identity of the real and the ideal, and how does he base his system on this main idea? The connection between subject and predicate, says he, when asserted by us in a sentence absolutely true, is not only taken in, but also put into reality, by the mind judging; for if it were outside us and taken up from there, its affirmation would not be absolutely, but hypothetically true, because dependent on an outward condition. But the real connection between subject and predicate also implies the reality of the subject and predicate connected; therefore, if a sentence is absolutely true, also its subject and predicate are taken in and put into reality by the mind. The subject and predicate, then, of any absolutely true sentence are the mind itself, which is both that of which something is thought or said, and that which is thought or said. All judgments of our mind may thus be reduced to the general and abstract formula: "I am I," or "the ego puts itself into reality." This absolutely and undeniably true principle, however, lying at the bottom of all judgments, must be conceived to be quite void of any determinate contents and to involve nothing but mere activity, by which pure and indeterminate being puts itself into reality. We arrive thus not only at the identity of thinking and being, of subject and object, but also at an absolute ego underlying our judgments; because the latter are nothing else but an act by which the ego affirms or realizes itself.

But the absolute ego never appears in its abstractedness or indetermination; since it always strives to determine itself or, as thinking and being are the same, to get conscious of itself as of a determinate being. To this tendency the ego, for an unaccountable reason, meets with a hindrance within itself; for as it can never determine itself fully, and never succeeds in thinking itself as the being containing all, but only as a being having some reality, we must suppose a hindrance in it, limiting or restricting its activity. Now this hindrance, as it is opposed to the ego and sets a limit or a negation of its entity, is to be considered as the non-ego. From this Fichte's second principle follows: "The non-ego is not the ego," or "the ego sets the non-ego in opposition to itself." Not only the hindrance, however, but also the determination effected by its limitation must be considered as a non-ego. Between the ego and the non-ego, that is, the hindrance, there is a mutual action and reaction. The hindrance acts on the ego and thus determines it: conversely the ego acts on the non-ego; because it continually strives to overcome the hindrance and to get conscious of its full entity. Thus Fichte arrives at his third fundamental principle: "The ego

sets a limited non-ego in opposition to the limited ego," which may be resolved into two others: "The ego limits or determines itself by the non-ego," and "the ego limits or determines the non-ego by itself." Any determinate object, therefore, which we perceive is a determination produced both in the ego by the non-ego and in the non-ego by the ego. Several definitions and conceptions are based thereon. Inasmuch as the ego is determined, it is passive, and the non-ego, on the contrary, active; but inasmuch as the ego determines the non-ego, it is active, and the non-ego passive. Inasmuch as the ego is passive, it is endowed with intellect; and inasmuch as it is active, it is endowed with will. As far as the ego is always limited by the non-ego, it is finite, and the non-ego infinite; but again as far as the ego has the tendency always to overcome the non-ego, its power, though not its act, is infinite, and the non-ego finite.

The absolute ego Fichte calls God. But God does not get conscious immediately by himself or as far as he is in the state of indetermination, but through infinitely many individual and determinate egos, contained in him as organs of consciousness. Of these each one is finite; only their evergrowing multitude is infinite. The collection of all the individual egos is mankind; whilst the hindrance is the material world. Mankind alone has entity or reality: matter is unreal; because it is nothing but a limit or negation to be destroyed by consciousness in an endless struggle.

Philosophy is the consciousness which the individual ego has of its being determined by the non-ego, and of its determining the non-ego, in order fully to realize itself. The consciousness of its being determined by the non-ego is theoretical, the consciousness of its determining the non-ego is practical philosophy.

The development of his system as just expounded, Fichte attained only in his last stage. In his work, Doctrine of Science (*Grundlage der Gesammten Wissenschaftslehre*), published in Leipsic, in 1794, he had still followed Kant in many respects, and ended by a mere subjective idealism, which resulted in negation, just as much as did the *Criticism of Pure Reason*. Denying the reality of the material world, he left entity to the thoughts of mankind alone, which, in his views, was a multitude of unconnected egos, each of them being absolute and independent. In this stage of idealism he did not term God the absolute ego comprising each individual consciousness, but the moral order of the world, that is, the complete destruction of matter, always attempted but never attained by the ego. Like Kant he also thought that God could not be reached by science or demonstration, but only by faith as a postulate of the practical reason. Being, therefore, accused of atheism and most severely criticized by Schelling, he conformed

to the views of the latter. In a new work on the blissful life in God (*Anweisung zum Gottseligen Leben*, Berlin, 1806) he said, that Deity is the absolute ego, manifesting itself in the consciousness of mankind. He had thus made a great step toward unity, but could not yet escape Schelling's blame. The latter objected against Fichte: first, that he admitted two worlds, one within, the other outside God, and, consequently, still supported dualism; secondly, that he said God so appeared in man alone and was visible, not as He is in Himself, but as He is in mankind; thirdly, that he defined matter to be unreal, and, nevertheless, required it as an active principle for the determination of the absolute ego. All these objections were evidently well grounded, and disclosed real defects in Fichte's theories.

Frederic William Schelling (born at Leonburg near Stuttgart, in 1775, died at Ragatz, in Switzerland, in 1854) had long before worked at a more consistent system of idealism. Its basis is also the identity of being and thinking; but this he so construed as not to deny the reality of nature like Fichte. At that end he endeavored to arrive by three different ways, starting each time from the conception of the absolute. These attempts, as they followed one another successively, we must distinguish as three different stages of his speculation.

First he conceived the absolute to be the identity of subject and object, or of the ideal and real as far as it contains them both, not divided, but reduced to indifference. This conception of the absolute, says he, is forced on us by the fact that being must be indifferently predicated, both of the real and the ideal order. We have, however, to consider the absolute in a twofold state: first, as the ground of being, in which subject and object are not yet distinguished, and secondly as being itself, in which subject and object are distinguished or set in opposition to each other and again reduced to indifference. The former is the undeveloped seed of entity (essence), the latter is entirely developed from it (absolute reason). The form, then, of developed entity consists essentially in the division of the essence into subject and object; neither one nor the other alone, but only both together constituting being. The object results from the tendency of the essence to bring itself forth into form, the subject from the tendency of the same to withdraw to itself the form brought forth. By bringing forth itself into form, the essence is transferred from the subjective into the objective; by withdrawing the form, it returns from the objective to the subjective order. The subject, as it determines or limits the object, implies a negative, the object, as it is determined or limited, a positive tendency. They are, consequently, opposed to each other, but do not remain in opposition, because by their very combination,

they tend towards indifference again. For this reason each single form of being bears the resemblance of the absolute, which is always, both in its essence and in its development, the identity of subject and object. Now as the division into subject and object and the reunion of them is a cognition, we may also say that cognition is the form of the developed being; on which account Schelling had called the absolute in its full development absolute reason. The absolute is all; since being is absolutely predicated of all things; without it there is nothing; whatsoever, therefore, has entity or existence, is contained in it, and is thus unchangeable, eternal, and infinite. Cognition, too, since it is nothing but the form of developed entity, cannot be without the absolute being. Hence as the formula "A = A" is the supreme principle of being, so the sentence "I am I" is the supreme principle of all true cognition, both expressing absolute identity.

The absolute essence develops itself by an inward necessity and from eternity in infinitely many forms, which all are cognitions, that is, combinations of subject and object (subject-objects). These forms are divided into two series, opposite to each other, like positive and negative poles; because they are so compounded of subject and object that in some the subject, in others the object is predominant. The difference between the subject and the object, making one predominant over the other, constitutes the finiteness of the single beings, as their indifference founds infinity. But though in each of the forms there is a difference between subject and object, nevertheless, as the series of those in which the subject is predominant counterpoises the opposite series of those in which the object prevails, the whole of them is again reduced to indifference. Thus it is clear that the totality of all the forms is the absolute being developed from its essence, and again that the absolute being is nothing else but the universe, the totality of all beings.

We must, however, still further examine the two series of development. That in which the object is predominant is called the order of the real or nature. In its lowest degree of evolution, the subject is least contained, and consequently cognition most imperfect or latent. Such is matter endowed with gravity. From this degree evolution grows by taking in more and more of the subject. The less the difference between subject and object becomes, the more cognition is apparent. So there are three succeeding stages of development: matter, light, organic life, the highest degree of which is in man. In the other series, in which the subject is predominant, and which is, therefore, called the order of the ideal, evolution goes on by imbedding in the subject more and more of the object. There are also three succeeding degrees of development in it: truth perceived by science, beauty embraced by religion,

beauty expressed by art, all which reaches its height in the ideal commonwealth. In man, as far as he is possessed with art and realizes the ideal commonwealth, the two series meet each other and return by his self-conscious reason to identity. But reason, having also several degrees of evolution, finally attains its highest perfection in the philosophy of the absolute. Consequently, though all the universe is the absolute being, because it tends to indifference by its two opposite tendencies, nevertheless chiefly man is God, since in him divinity is perfect; and among men chiefly, the philosopher is the absolute, because in him the ideality or indifference of the universe is accomplished.

Schelling in this way explains even the incarnation of the Divine Word. Before Christ, said he, man acknowledged nature to be God, which was not an error, but a lower degree of consciousness; in Christ and the Apostles, he became conscious of being God himself: thus God became man. His consciousness of Divinity arrived at by Christianity was again completed by the philosophy of the absolute, which establishes in man the entire identity of the subject and the object.[1]

From this first stage of his speculation, which is generally styled the Philosophy of Identity, he soon proceeded to set forth a new theory of the absolute, somewhat akin to Platonism. He now said that the absolute was, in its essence, merely ideal, and developed itself, not by differences, but by intuition. Reflecting on itself from eternity, the absolute produces its own likeness, which is its form, its reality, and its object. But this likeness, for the very reason that it resembles the absolute, has the power also to produce its idea or image, and thus to transform itself into reality. Now the first idea, having received the entity of the absolute by communication, and, consequently, possessing also its independence and freedom, can conceive itself under a twofold respect, either as proceeding from, and depending on, the absolute, or as being independent and having its own entity. If it conceives itself under the latter respect, it falls off from the absolute. But thus withdrawn from its origin, in which alone it has true entity and freedom, it loses its productive power, and is henceforth not able to create aught but

[1] Schelling expounds the system spoken of in the following of his works:

a. Darstellung meines Systems der Philosophie, published in the periodical, Zeitschrift für Speculative Physik, von Schelling, Jena and Leipzig, 1800–1801. Band II.

b. Zweite mit Zusätzen bereicherte Ausgabe der Ideen zu einer Philosophie der Natur, 1803.

c. Fernere Darstellungen aus dem System der Philosophie, published in the periodical, Neue Zeitschrift für Speculative Physik, Tubingen, 1802.

d. Jahrbücher der Medicin, in Gemeinschaft mit Marcus herausgegeben, Tubingen, 1806.

images of its own nothingness. Such are sensible objects, which are mere appearances, having no reality in themselves, but only relatively to the idea withdrawn from the absolute. The sensible world, therefore, is nothing but the ruins of the ideal.

An idea of this kind is the human soul, which, inasmuch as it depends on the absolute being, is infinite; but inasmuch as it has fallen off from it, is entangled in the sensitive world, united to a body finite and individual. As far as it can either return to God from its finiteness, or abide in separation from him, it is endowed with finite liberty, the possibility to do good or evil. The destination of the soul is its detachment from self and its return to the absolute, to be attained by its retirement from the sensible and the contemplation of the ideal. If, during this life, the soul has not detached itself from matter, it shall, after death, be embodied again. Finally, however, all souls will return to God, the immaterial world will then vanish away, and the real will perfectly coalesce with the ideal. According to this theory, God is incarnate in the world from eternity, and successively falling off and returning to himself gets at last enriched with full reality.[1]

Yet Schelling's speculation had not reached its last stage. In his latter years he devised a system which, combining the two former, was to account scientifically for the mysteries of Christianity, and is, therefore, called "Mystic-theosophistic (theological) Philosophy."

According to these latest views of his, three moments are to be distinguished in the absolute; first, the last ground or essence; secondly, the division of the essence into two opposite elements, into cause and existence, or into darkness and light, or into nature and reason; thirdly, the reunion of the elements divided. The indifferent essence is the possibility of the Divine Being, which, however, is never merely possible, but always tends to existence or determinations by being differenced within itself from all eternity. As God, the absolute being, exists by himself, he is the cause or origin of his existence. For this reason his essence necessarily gets into opposition between cause and existence, which two are also really not only logically distinct. As cause God strives to bring forth himself. But this is at first a blind and unsuccessful tendency; he succeeds in bringing forth himself into existence only by begetting reason and forming an idea of himself, the eternal word. From this we understand that cause, nature, and darkness on one side; existence, reason, and light on the other, are one and the

---

[1] This system Schelling expounds in the two following works:

a. Philosophie und Religion. Tubingen, 1804.

b. Darlegung des wahren Verhältnisses der Natur-philosophie zur verbesserten Fichtischen Lehre. Tubingen, 1806.

selfsame thing. But the different elements are to be reduced to indifference again; therefore they struggle with one another until reason entirely pervades nature and enters into union with it. The result of this union is love or the spirit. In this system Schelling ascribes the realization of the absolute, not to the intellect, but to the will, calling the tendency of blind nature the particular or egotistic, that of reason the universal will.

This process of evolution, by which God attains his perfection, is cosmogony, that is, the generation of the world. The cause or blind nature first developed from divine essence is matter; light or reason begotten of matter is the order brought into it; matter and light together form the world. First matter alone exerts its activity; but its products perish, their remnants being still found in the paleontological plants and animals; then light proceeds from matter, not at once, but by degrees, the highest of which is in man. From man arises the spirit, also by a successive elevation; because there is in human nature as everywhere in the world a prolonged struggle between the particular and the universal will. Though man having become spirit is so far the highest appearance of the absolute and even its actual existence; he is, nevertheless, not yet the absolute itself; because in this the opposite elements cannot be separated again, but in man they can. In him the particular will can oppose the universal. From this the possibility of doing good or evil results. Good is the subjection of the particular unto the universal will, or the union of them both; evil is the opposition between them, the abiding in ourselves, or the separation from God. Through this opposition between the two wills man must pass with absolute necessity, in order that the absolute may attain its last and full realization. The particular will, therefore, must tempt and draw man to sin. But at last reason (the divine word) or the universal will shall overcome the particular and enter with it into an indissoluble union. Then God will be perfect and all in all. It is not difficult to see how this speculation was intended to unfold the mysteries of the Blessed Trinity, the Incarnation, the Redemption from sin by the Word, and of man's final bliss in God, or rather to strip them of their supernatural truth and make them mere allegories and myths representing the tenets of pantheism.[1]

Schelling's philosophy was considered to be one of the sublimest productions of the human mind. It was, however, generally admitted that the style of his writings was rather poetical than philo-

[1] This system Schelling first set forth in his renowned work on the nature of human freedom (Ueber das Wesen der menschlichen Freiheit, Landshut, 1809). He developed and completed it afterwards in his Prelections on the Philosophy of Mythology and Revelation, published by Trauenstädt under the title, Vorlesungen Schellings in Berlin, 1842.

sophical; that his method was by no means strict and logical; and that he had been continually changing his views and contradicting his own principles. There was on this account much complaining about the confusion and obscurity of his system. A clearer and more scientific proof of Idealism was still looked for.

This was attempted by George William Hegel (born in Stuttgart in 1770, died in Berlin in 1831). The following is an outline of his system:

The universal alone has entity and reality; the individual or particular is but a transient opposition, consequently unreal and nothing in itself. Now as the universal determines and realizes itself by contrasts without losing its identity, and as such an immanent activity is dialectical or intellectual, it must be the same as thought. The universal, therefore, does not result from thought; for it exists by itself and only becomes self-conscious in our mind; nor is thought the affection of a subject, for it is being itself. If we moreover examine what kind of thought the universal may be, we find it to be contained in conception. The latter, consequently, is the substance underlying all phenomena, the essence of all things, the reality of all that exists.

As to the development or the determination, which being takes by differences or contrasts, Hegel generally follows Schelling. We must distinguish in each development three moments. In the first the universal or thought is still indeterminate and indifferent; in the second it turns itself into its opposite, that is into the particular or individual by denying its own universality; in the third it denies the negation of its universality, and thus withdraws and unites its opposite with itself. By a succession of such divisions and reunions being grows in reality, and gets at last enriched with all determinations. The first moment is also called the thesis, the second the antithesis, the third the synthesis. Now as the universal is identical with conception, they both have just the same evolution. But conception evolves itself in three great periods. It is first pure or logical thought; then it turns itself into its opposite, that is, into the individual or nature; and finally, it returns to itself by denying and withdrawing nature, and thus becomes self-conscious or spirit. In the first of these periods it is by itself, in the second out of itself, in the third in itself.

The stages and degrees into which each of these periods is subdivided, have to be particularly considered.[1] Pure thought, in its first stage, is indeterminate being, which is the same as becoming, because it is all and nothing. It is all, because it is universal and

[1] Each degree of the first period is a dialectical form, which, as thinking and being are the same, is identical with an ontological category. The whole first period forms logic and ontology.

predicated of everything; it is nothing, because it is no particular being. But being all and being nothing, or rather being and not being make up becoming, which implies the idea of something that is and is not. Such a character, being evinces in its endless evolution, on account of which it is in continual motion, always vanishing away and arising again. Indeterminate being itself has to undergo a threefold evolution by the way of division and reunion; for it is quality, quantity, and measure; quantity being the outward determination of quality, and measure the union of them both. This evolution being finished, pure thought arises at its second stage, that is, it becomes essence, which is the apparition of being to itself. The essence again is first the ground of existence, then it passes over into appearance, finally it withdraws the appearance to itself and becomes actuality, which is the ground supporting the appearance. From this thought grows to conception, the union of being and essence, the third stage of the first period. Conception, too, has three degrees of evolution. In the first it is subjective, and as such it is first indeterminate and general (conception as such), then it is divided into subject and predicate (judgment), at last reunited (conclusion). In the second degree of evolution it is objective, that is, it becomes object, not yet an individual, but an abstract and universal one. This object first consists of beings considered in themselves and not yet connected, then of beings connected inwardly, at last of the result of their connection. In the third degree of evolution the conception withdraws the object to itself and thus becomes idea, which again is first life, then cognition, at last absolute idea, the union of life and cognition. In the absolute idea the conception as being by itself has attained its highest perfection, and is ripe for going out of itself by becoming an individual object. So it enters upon its second period of evolution. The idea then becomes nature, its own outside and contrast. Nature, too, has to go through three stages of development answering those of thought. As being, thought turns itself into matter connected only mechanically or outwardly; as essence, into matter connected inwardly by action and reaction; as idea, into organic life existing in the earth, the plants, the animals.[1] From the animal life the human spirit is developed, who first sets in opposition and then unites the individual object to thought. Thus we have come to the last period of evolution, in which thought is in itself, and the synthesis of idea and nature is accomplished. This period, too, comprises three stages.

The spirit in its first stage is subjective; and in the first degree of this stage the soul of nature, being immortal, feeling, and actual;

[1] To each degree of evolution in the second period answers a branch of natural philosophy, which again, as thinking and being are identical, coincides as to reality with nature itself.

in the second degree ego or consciousness, being first conscious, then self-conscious, at last reason; in the third degree spirit, the union of soul and consciousness, being intellect, will, and freedom. The spirit is intellect, inasmuch as it gives its own form to the object; will, inasmuch as it is conscious of having done so; freedom, inasmuch as the intellect and the will are united. In the second stage the spirit becomes objective by bringing forth the world of freedom: right (regarding property, contracts, and punishment of injury); honesty (concerning voluntariness and guilt, intention and well-being, good and evil); morally (in the family, society, and the State). In the third stage the spirit, withdrawing the world of freedom to itself, becomes absolute. As such it is the absolute and complete union of subject and object, of idea and nature by the consciousness of being both one and the other. Even to this height of perfection the spirit arrives by degrees, for it knows itself to be all or the identity of the subjective and objective order, first by art, then by religion, finally by philosophy. By art it knows itself to be all beauty (reality under sensitive forms), by religion all spirit, by philosophy both beauty and spirit. Philosophy, too, has many evolutions and is fully perfected by Hegel, for he aroused mankind to perfect consciousness.[1]

The ideas of morality and religion, as contained in this system, need some further explanation. Religion is only a moment of philosophy. Philosophy is the science of the divine evolutions or the consciousness of reason, by which she knows herself to be all. Religion, too, is self-consciousness and knowledge of God. The difference between one and the other lies in the way and in the degree in which they make the absolute identity of all known or raise the absolute spirit to consciousness. Religion exhibits the absolute identity to our feeling by symbols and myths, philosophy to our intellect by ideas; religion arouses the spirit to the consciousness of being all spirit, philosophy to that of being both spirit and nature. Religion has a double aspect; it is both in God and in man. In man it is the knowledge he has of God, in God it is the self-consciousness he attains in man. It is, nevertheless, one and the selfsame act; for as God gets self-conscious only in man, man's knowledge of God is nothing but the consciousness of his being in God. The degrees by which such consciousness is attained are the different religions successively existing in the world.

The main idea of all religions is the reconciliation of the finite with the infinite; for as religion is God's self-consciousness attained

[1] To the evolutions of the third period belong: anthropology, phenomenology, pneumatology, ethics, jurisprudence, politics, theology, philosophy.

Hegel's system is, at length, expounded in his Encyclopædia of the Philosophical Sciences (Encyclopædie der philosophischen Wissenschaften, Heidelberg, 1817).

in man, by it the finite is lifted up and united to the infinite. This reconciliation attempted by all forms of religions was not accomplished but by Christianity. By this, God has become fully self-conscious in man. The dogmas of Christianity, therefore, must express the evolutions of the conception. They, consequently, disclose the Divine life in its three great periods, or the conception as it is by itself, out of itself, and in itself. The first of these periods may be called the reign of the Father, the second the reign of the Son, the third the reign of the Spirit. The first period is the life of God before the generation of the world, and consists chiefly in his evolution into Trinity. Inasmuch as God is by himself, He is the Father; inasmuch as He is out of himself, He is the Son; inasmuch as He is in himself, He is the Spirit. Only note that the Son is not nature, but the conception itself inasmuch as it turns itself into nature. The second period of the Divine life comprises man's fall into sin and redemption by Christ. Nature, as first put forth by the conception, was still indeterminate, containing matter and reason indifferently. But it was necessary that it should be divided in man, and that reason should come into opposition with matter. This division, however, being opposition between the universal and the particular, was of evil, not because such a conflict ought not to be, but because it has to be overcome by reunion. Therefore, as the conception also, as far as it is out of itself, must for the sake of evolution be continually divided and reunited, it is quite necessary that man fall into sin; and even that sin be involved in his very nature. From sin we are redeemed by the reconciliation of the finite and the infinite in our own persons. But this presupposes in our minds the certain knowledge that the opposition between the particular and the universal, the finite and the infinite, is as such unreal, and has been overcome. Now in Christ, this reunion is symbolically exhibited; He is for this reason called God-Man. His death is the symbol of God's denying his own infinity and becoming finite nature; his resurrection from the dead the symbol of his denying the finiteness of nature and restoring his infinity. The reconciliation of the finite and the infinite as such being exhibited in Christ, each individual man can become conscious that it is realized also in his own person. The reunion of the conflicting elements being accomplished, the third period, the reign of the Spirit, begins. From the reconciliation of the particular and the universal God arises as the spirit of the community; for as the latter so consists of many members that their unity is real and their plurality only apparent, in it God becomes conscious of his being all Spirit. The testimony which he thus gives, or the consciousness which he thus attains of himself, is called faith. The object of the latter, therefore, is the accomplishment of the reconciliation between the

finite and the infinite, between nature and God. From these premises Hegel deduces the justification of man by faith alone, and the other dogmas of old Lutheranism, which he in this way reduced to a scientific form and inserted in his pantheistic system.

Religion is not the foundation of morality, but rather succeeds it as a higher degree of evolution. We have already seen that honesty in its highest development regards good and evil. Good is the union of the particular and universal, or the subjection of the former unto the latter. Evil, on the contrary, is the prevailing of the finite over the infinite, or the opposition of the particular to the universal. As far as ever good is realized in social life, in which the individual is indeed subject to the whole, and the particular beings coalesce in one universal being, honesty becomes morality. Society, then, is morality itself; and the more society is extended and united, the higher a degree of morality it is. Social life is most perfect in the state which is not distinguished from, or subject to the Church, but rather replaces, and contains it as one of its moments. To live, therefore, in the state, according to its laws, is consummate virtue. Yea, since the state is the supreme evolution of the objective spirit, it is God himself present and actual in the world, or the Divine will putting itself into act and organization. Among the several states again one usually prevails. This Hegel calls the world-spirit, and maintains that, as long as it upholds its pre-eminency, the others are in regard to it without rights.

As Hegel in a general way completed the systems of Fichte and Schelling, so he brought also the ideas of religion and morality, as consistent with idealism, to their last development. Between him and Schelling there is scarcely any considerable difference in this regard. Schelling also places moral evil in the opposition of the particular to the universal, and moral good and happiness in the union of them both; in his system also the State is over the Church, and philosophy over religion. Fichte in his later period, when he began to yield to Schelling, admitted morality to consist in the union of the finite with the absolute; but in his former period, when yet a follower of Kant, he thought it to lie in the destruction of the non-ego, from which the infinity of the ego would result. Man, then, would be the more moral, the more he succeeded in overcoming the limit. The complete destruction of the non-ego, which, however, will never be accomplished, Fichte calls the moral order, and this again, as it is the infinity of the ego, he thinks to be God. It is evident from this that morality and divinity result merely from the human will. God, conceived as a being distinct from the world, and existing by and in itself, Fichte thought, would imply inextricable contradictions and be nothing but a fiction of

our intellect. Morality and religion are thus one and the self-same thing in his view.

Hegel's system was considered by his followers to be the highest evolution of philosophy. To find fault with it was the height of ignorance. It was to be received as complete and absolute wisdom, at least on account of the authority of its sublime inventor, until a higher and immediate insight into it would be obtained by assiduous study. Nobody has indeed brought forth another development of idealism after Hegel. Nevertheless, after having been highly admired for some time, especially in Berlin, he began to be severely attacked, most of all by Arthur Schoppenhauer. Soon his own school went asunder into two opposite parties. One stuck to Hegel's tenets just as they were set forth by him; the other drew the consequences contained in them. This latter party prevailed over the former. Idealism, then, in its strict sense was given up and Atheism, Materialism, and Nihilism was successively embraced. The Atheists, who started from idealism, were headed by Lewis Feuerbach, the Materialists by Charles Vogt, the Nihilists by Edward von Hartmann, the author of *The Philosophy of the Unconscious*, published from 1868 to 1875 in seven editions. It cannot be denied that idealism gave rise to all these systems, however much it seems to be opposed to them. If God has no reality distinct from the world, or rather if the reality of the world is God himself in his evolutions, it is consequent that there is no personal God. Again, if being and thinking are the same, the Materialists have as much right to begin with matter and to bury thought in it, as the Idealists had to start from thought and to lift up matter to its sphere. Finally, a system which makes being consist of a combination of contradictions, was not without reason turned into Nihilism. It should, however, be remarked, that in our days modern speculation is generally based on Kant, because its tenets are more simply and easily explained by inborn forms and illusions of the mind, than by the abstruse theories of ideal evolution.

Now is it not useless to criticize the systems just expounded, the absurdity of which is so evident to common-sense? We must not forget that they are of the highest importance in modern history, and that our century did not view them in this light. First Idealism spread nearly over the whole civilized world. It originated in Germany, and was not only hailed by Protestants, but also admired by some Catholics. From Germany it was imported into France, and of late also into Italy; it found its way to England and even to America. Then both in science and in practical life it has brought forth highly important effects. There is in this century scarcely any error in Theology or Philosophy, within and without the Church, which has not sprung from these systems commenced

by Des Cartes and completed by Hegel. That Atheism, Materialism, and Nihilism are their genuine offspring, we have just shown. And is it not also a revival of Kant's inborn forms of thinking and reasoning, when modern textbooks and professors of philosophy, at the very outset of their courses, lay it down as an axiom that nothing exists but what we perceive by our senses; that God and the spirituality of the human soul are mere illusions, and that, therefore, metaphysics has no other object than the acts of our mind, and must be replaced by dialectics? But even where the principles of these systems were not admitted, they did not fail to produce harmful effects. They first discredited scholastic philosophy in public opinion, and caused it to be gradually removed from Catholic schools. Then they brought disgrace on philosophy in general and on human reason itself; because the monstrous errors of the modern, and the failure of the ancient philosophers seemed to evidence the incapacity of reason to attain truth. In France this gave rise to Traditionalism, in Germany and other countries to the neglect of philosophical studies. Even the political errors of our time are based on idealism. Revolution is justified by its first moral principle that human reason is absolute, autonomous, and ought not to receive a law from without. But also the absolutism of monarchs and of the stronger political parties is prompted by the theory that the individual ought to be swallowed up by the universal. Above all the tyranny practiced by the political power over consciences and religious associations is not to be blamed, if Church and religion are only inferior evolutions of the absolute to be transformed into the State or philosophy. There is, on this account, no doubt that, though Idealism as a philosophical system is out of date at present, nevertheless many of its principles and its baneful consequences still exist, and poison both the public life and the science of our days. All this considered, I think it will not be without interest to search into the very foundations of these systems, and to inquire whether they are really reduced to that unity which should be looked upon as a proof of their truth, and avert cultivated minds from the study of Ancient Philosophy.

DE LA SALLE: HIS LIFE AND WORK.

THE American tourist who enters Rheims for the first time is generally disappointed. He knows it is a very old city, and one that has played many a bright part in history. He has perhaps fresh in mind a few scraps of the Gallic War, and has probably been musing for some time back on the long procession of kings that came up to the Cathedral Church to receive their crowns from the successors of St. Rémi. His classical reminiscences and historical readings have doubtless forced him to the conclusion that the Rheims which was built before the Franks crossed the Rhine, which witnessed the baptism of Clovis, and the triumphant entry of the Maid of Orleans, must needs be a quaint-looking, old-fashioned town. And indeed his expectations are not altogether vain; for he soon meets with a gate that reminds him of the Roman occupation, and descries a lofty pile that tells of pre-mediæval times. An hour's ramble, however, through the long, broad, and well-paved streets suffices to break the spell, and to show that the veil of antiquity has long since been torn away. The Rheims of the Merovingian kings, those hale monarchs *à la longue chevelure*, has been mercilessly modernized.

In straying through this seat of active industry our tourist, whose keen eye has been trained to minute inspection, soon finds himself before a spacious and antique-looking building. It evidently saw palmier days. It bears a commemorative tablet, which soon becomes an object of close scrutiny. And well it may; for in that house—once a noble mansion—was born a man of note, a philanthropist of the purest type, a public benefactor, Jean Baptiste de la Salle.

The De la Salles held a goodly rank among the nobility of Champagne. For years they had figured with distinction on the bench, and worn the highest civic honors. Their *hotel* was noted for its *bon ton*, and was a favorite resort for men of letters, men of the gown, and the fashionable society of the place. The spirit of chivalry and adventure was not alien to the family. It shone out brilliantly in Marquette, one of the pioneers of American exploration, and in three brave young fellows who fought by the side of our raw provincials in the War of Independence.

But the charming evening parties of the *Hotel de la Croix d'Or* did less to perpetuate and popularize the name of De la Salle than the less brilliant but more enduring achievements of the great educator, whose life and work we shall now endeavor to sketch.

Jean Baptiste de la Salle was born on the last day of April, 1651. His fond mother emulated the saintly Blanche of Castile in her

solicitude for her son. She strove to mould his dispositions to gentleness and piety, and every night besought Heaven to bless her endeavors. When only eight years old the boy was entered at the University School of Rheims, where he soon gave signs of real talent. Time showed that his was not the precocity that flashes out meteorlike only to be prematurely quenched in mediocrity. He never acquired the unenviable distinction of a little prodigy. He was always a hard and steady worker, trusting more to application than to his versatile endowments.

His academical success was especially gratifying to his father, who was not slow in forming high hopes and ambitious projects. He was easily convinced that his son would make his mark at the bar, and that he would ultimately win a distinguished place in the magistracy. But Heaven ruled it otherwise, and the boy was as docile to its call as the young Samuel of old. It was soon noticed that the promising student did not relish the warmly-colored schemes of his father. He aspired to something higher than family aggrandizement and civic honors; and, every evening as he knelt before his little altar, he recommended his cause to the Queen of Heaven. We can readily conceive the mute disappointment and the vexation of M. de la Salle on learning that his eldest son seriously thought of embracing the ecclesiastical state. But the future Levite was as constant in his resolve as he was amiable in urging it. His gentleness and perseverance finally overcame all obstacles, and M. de la Salle, fearing to cross the ways of Providence, gave in his acquiescence.

At nineteen, De la Salle had completed his course of philosophy and taken his M.A. degree. Without loss of time, he proceeded to Paris to study theology in the most famous schools of the kingdom. He chose the Seminary of St. Sulpice for his residence, in the hopes of finding in its strict discipline a safeguard against the distractions of a frivolous Capital. He clearly saw that study, to be thorough, must be done quietly and sequentially. For this purpose, he treated himself with Spartan severity, cutting off even legitimate pleasures, and eliminating every cause of disturbance and distraction. Like Gregory and Basil at Athens, he knew little else of the gay and noisy world outside than the dingy streets which led up to the theological schools, the famous Sorbonne. Nothing could be more in harmony with his task than this studious seclusion. It formed a golden period; but unfortunately, like all temporal enjoyments, it proved very evanescent. The young theological student had scarcely accustomed himself to his new mode of life before he was abruptly summoned home by an event which never fails to overwhelm a loving heart with grief. In July, 1671, he lost his beloved mother; and in the following April he received

the dying bequests of his father. The twofold blow was severe. Adversity is pre-eminently the school in which firm and energetic characters are moulded and tempered. After passing through it, one is able to bear without breaking the strain of honors and success, as well as the stress of disappointment and humiliation.

The young De la Salle keenly felt the bereavement, and at once realized the responsibilities of his new position. For a moment his vocation seemed to quiver in the balance. The dilemma was certainly trying. He had just turned twenty-one, and found himself head of the family, a noble family too; he had to direct the education of his brothers and sisters as well as to superintend the administration of a rich patrimony. Many would have found in such duties a plausible pretext for relinquishing all further aspirations to the priesthood; but not so with De la Salle. His vocation was not a whim, it was not the outgrowth of an impulse. It was a call from Heaven, a grace. He would not trifle with so sacred a thing. It is true he did not well see his way out of present embarrassments; but he trusted in Providence, and set to ordering his household affairs. He drew up a regulation for the juvenile community of which he was the acknowledged head, and insisted on its faithful observance. The youthful legislator instinctively recognized that "Order is Heaven's first law," and he was thoroughly convinced that a mild but steady discipline is by far the best kindness for children, just as method is the best economizer of time and the surest passport to success.

His new occupations did not, however, divert his attention from his favorite studies. He regularly devoted his leisure hours to reading works on divinity. He had a praiseworthy ambition for theological honors, and hoped one day to win the doctor's cap. The chapter of the Cathedral Church of his native city had for ages been renowned for the learning of its Canons. Several had worn the tiara, and many more attained the highest ecclesiastical dignities in the kingdom. It had even grown into a custom that at least three-fourths of its members should be Doctors in Divinity. The young De la Salle, whose recognized merit had gained him admittance into this distinguished body at the early age of sixteen, daily endeavored to make up by his culture, refinement, and amiability for the peculiar grace and dignity which years alone can give. At twenty-seven he went in for his licentiateship in theology, and obtained it. At thirty he brilliantly defended his thesis before the faculty of the Rheims University, and was admitted to the Doctor's degree. In the meantime the clouds that darkened the horizon had broken, and his path was lit up once more with a cheerful beam. He had advised with experienced directors, and succeeded in putting his family affairs into good working order

without necessitating much personal superintendence. Freed in great measure from the absorbing cares of an extensive administration, he centred all his thoughts on his vocation. During six years he had prepared himself by prayer and study for the crowning act of his life, and now the long-wished-for day was about to dawn. On the Easter eve of 1678 the noble candidate for Orders knelt at the Altar, and received from the hands of his Archbishop the sacerdotal unction. Next morning, at an early hour, he said Mass in a retired chapel in the great Cathedral. No fond parents, no admiring friends, no worshipping throng gathered round the Altar. Unobserved by men, but admired by angels, he offered his first Mass.

He now felt that henceforth he must devote himself to the welfare of his neighbor. No sacrifice seemed too great, no act of abnegation excessive. His first project was to exchange his Canoncy for a parish in one of the poorer quarters of the city; but his brothers and relatives appreciated neither his disinterestedness nor his apostolic motives. They thought that family prestige would be dimmed by his accepting a penurious curacy. They urged that a young Doctor of Divinity should display his erudition from a renowned pulpit, not from the Altar steps of an obscure parish. They did not fail to use their influence at the Archiepiscopal palace; and as Mgr. le Tellier knew and prized the qualities of the young abbé, little pressure was needed to induce him to retain in his chapter one of its finest ornaments. The voice of his Archbishop was, to De la Salle, an oracle; no word of remonstrance escaped his lips. He submitted with cheerfulness.

Foiled in one direction his zeal sought an outlet in another. This time it was the educational condition of the humbler classes that attracted his attention. The monastic schools had been swept away by the revolutionary flood of the sixteenth century, and such was the generosity of the Reformers, and the widespread influence of their downhill Reformation, that no adequate substitute was offered in their stead. The "reformers" were indeed expert at levelling institutions. They freed the people from the yoke of instruction, and gave them in exchange the husks of ignorance and the seeds of anarchy. "In the Dark Ages," said Canon Farrar the other day at an educational meeting in London, "the chasm between primary and secondary, and between the latter and university education, was not so great as now. It was possible for a boy, no matter how poor his father might be, by being diligent and receiving the education which was *freely* offered him in the *monastic schools* to rise to the very highest positions.[1] That was possible in

[1] "Poverty, in the Dark Ages, was recognized not as the accident of a student's life, but as one of its most honorable features, and it was reckoned as something monstrous and disgraceful for a man to sell his learning for gold."—*Christian Schools and Scholars.*

consequence of the recognition, by the Church in those times, of the principle that knowledge is far better than force, and virtue a more valuable possession than wealth or rank." So said the eloquent canon of St. Paul's, and so think all who are well read on the subject. But flippant writers of our own times, and notably some of our "scientists," ignore these and a hundred kindred facts. They fancy that because they have spent many of their best years in theorizing about solar physics and stellar chemistry, or perchance writing manuals of physiology, they may dogmatize with equal assurance about history, philosophy, and religion. No wonder then that they make a hopeless medley of the whole; that for reason, they substitute passion, and for argument a flood of vituperative nonsense. One Loyola, one De la Salle is more than a refutation of their furious diatribes. These men prized instruction and loved education quite as much as our high-talking professors. Men of sterling merit and far-reaching ken, they did not write themselves tired or talk themselves hoarse on the ignorance and degenerate state of the people. They did better. They resolutely set to work to educate youth, and thereby elevate and, in time, improve the social condition of the masses. Admirers have erected statues to Howard and Peabody; grateful posterity would honor itself by raising noble monuments to Loyola and De la Salle.

It is with the latter that we are now more particularly concerned. De la Salle was no furious writer nor idle declaimer. He was preeminently a man of action. He preferred a grain of practice to a pound of theory. After drawing up his plan and assuring himself of its practicability, he surrounded himself with a few generous volunteers, explained to them his programme, and opened a school. The Order of the Brothers of the Christian Schools was virtually founded. This was in June, 1681. Succeeding months added to the number of young men who gathered round the noble schoolmaster. Their success attracted attention, and the local authorities in many places became anxious to secure their services. Notwithstanding the vigorous opposition of his relatives, De la Salle introduced his first disciples into his own wealthy mansion. They shared his table, listened to his counsels, and discussed with him the most eligible means of prospering and perpetuating their undertaking. He early apprehended that in order to insure the stability of his followers, he should assimilate himself to their condition. To do this implied the renunciation of his canoncy and even the distribution of his patrimony. "Renounce all your possessions," said an austere adviser to him, "give up your canonical dignity, forego all idea of promotion in the Church, sacrifice the pleasures of wealth, become voluntarily poor. Your example will

have greater effect upon your disciples than the most eloquent and pathetic discourses." Once convinced of the advantages of the step, he was not dismayed at its magnitude; he did not hesitate. The sacrifice was great, but not too great for his expansive and capacious heart.

His worldly-minded friends, however, stole a march on him. They apprised Mgr. le Tellier of his extravagant intentions, and besought him to interpose his authority anew. The illustrious archbishop for a moment played into their hands; but on mature examination withdrew his veto, and allowed the young abbé to consummate his heroic sacrifice. As soon as his successor was installed in the chapter, he assembled his followers and sang a *Te Deum* for the happy issue of an event which he believed would largely contribute to the consolidation of the new institute. A little later, De la Salle and twelve of his earliest disciples knelt at the foot of the altar, and, assuming the name of Brothers of the Christian Schools, bound themselves to their new and arduous calling by the vows of religion. The seed was now fairly sown. It required but time to germinate, to blossom, and bear abundant fruit.

The cradle of the new institute was not, however, rocked in idyllic calmness. The storm muttered around it, and at last the tempest roared.

The "writing-masters" of Paris became alarmed at the spread of the new teaching Order. They formed a strong coalition, and resolved to put it down by main force, They were so indignant at the violation of their supposed rights that they summarily proceeded to eject both boys and masters from their schools. But De la Salle appeared in the law courts against their overbearing guild, pleaded his case with eloquence, and shattered the claims of the insolent monopoly. These and similar vexations chiefly served to enhance his reputation and establish his Congregation more firmly.

De la Salle now became the champion of popular education. He fought its first battles, and won its first victories. It was not celebrity that he courted; he wanted but the liberty of doing good. He clearly saw the imperfections of the existing methods of instruction. They were many and radical. The individual system seemed to him admirably adapted to favor idleness and loss of time. He rejected it as a whole, substituting in its stead the "simultaneous" method, by which the teacher addresses himself to a numerous division, generally to a whole class, at a time. The change was an immense progress. It gave a grand impetus to education. It increased tenfold the efficiency of the master, and diminished his drudgery while insuring substantial results.

Had De la Salle done no more than this he would have well

deserved to be classed among the friends and benefactors of truth. This bold innovation has alone done more for the advancement of primary education and the general diffusion of knowledge than most of the reforms of later educationists. We often hear of Pestalozzi and his methods; and, notwithstanding the ringing phrases of his panegyrists, we are unable to see that his achievements warrant the reputation he seems to have gained. According to himself he had an "unrivalled incapacity" for governing others, and he even admits that he could neither read, write, nor cipher respectably. As to the efficiency of his methods, Ramsauer, who was one of his favorite disciples, tells us that "*he* got as much regular schooling as the other pupils, namely, none at all." Admirers may comment upon his "devoted love," and may even wax warm over his "burning zeal." Pestalozzi seems to us a mere enthusiast, and his methods little else than visible eccentricities.

Among the educational reformers whose names have been trumpeted down to our times we may mention Jacotot and Lancaster. Jacotot was unquestionably a clever man, but his methods were too extravagant to outlive their originator. As to Lancaster, we need only enter a government school in London or Liverpool to realize, at a glance, the numerous and grievous drawbacks of his system. It is indeed much to the credit of English teachers that they have borne so long with so wretched a system. Compared with these educators the merits of De la Salle are transcendent.

But De la Salle did more than dismiss an imperfect and effete system from schools, and replace it by another which has worked successfully during the last two centuries; he remodelled the whole plan of studies. Up to his time Latin was the basis of elementary education. The first book which the child had to finger was a psalter. Of course he understood nothing of what he read; and, if we suppose it part of the master's duty to correct false quantities, then his must have been a rude task. When the boy read fluently (for he never read correctly), and had mastered the rudiments of Latin grammar, he was allowed to take up the study of his own language.

Such a course appears to us simply preposterous, and so it did to Fénélon, to the philosophers of Port Royal, and to De la Salle. It was, however, no easy matter to overthrow a long-established custom; but De la Salle never quailed before difficulties. Convinced of the necessity of abolishing the illogical system, he led the way. In all his schools the mother tongue was the first the little learner was made to lisp; and it was only when fairly proficient in French that he was taught to read Latin. The change roused many wrathful critics, who railed and stormed at the reformer; but nothing daunted by their fierce attacks he continued

to build up his great national (cosmopolitan?) system on this foundation. The success of his schools at length disarmed criticism, and won him the approbation of the universities and of the highest authorities in Church and State.

Soon after this we find him heading another important work, viz., an institution to train competent masters for country schools. This was the natural outgrowth of his great undertaking. In 1685 he opened his *Seminaire de Maîtres d'Ecole*. It was the first training school, and therefore the antetype of the normal schools and training colleges of our own days. Candidates for admission were required to pass a preliminary examination. The discipline of the house was strict but parental,—De la Salle understood no other,—and the course of studies was remarkably comprehensive. Indeed, although two hundred years have elapsed since it was drawn up, it is coextensive with the *programmes d'etudes* framed for training schools at different times by the French Ministry of Public Instruction and, notably, with that issued in 1851.

This again shows the clearness with which De la Salle apprehended the wants of his time, and the thoroughness with which he provided for them. In another important question, too, he anticipated a movement which is commonly supposed to have had its origin in a progressive age. In 1699 he established regular public courses in science and art. The classes were held on Sundays from 12 to 3, and instruction was given by the Brothers in mathematics, drawing, and architecture. The most astonishing feature in this innovation is doubtless that the classes were held on Sunday, and, next to this, the courses were given free of charge. People of a Puritanic turn may be shocked at what they may consider an infraction of the Sabbath; but our modern zealots, whose rallying-cry is "Educate the people, educate the masses," will surely not disapprove so useful an employment of the Sunday. Perhaps also they will henceforth think more highly of a body of men who give the people sound instruction in science and art without asking for any fees. But be it said, *en passant*, these social regenerators of ours indulge, by times, in much vapid declamation. Real knowledge or "solid thoughts" on the subject, they seem to have none. Their addresses to meetings, their communications to the daily press, show a discreditable amount of ignorance of the history and philosophy of education, while their acts and projects but too frequently remind one of the schemes and feats of the mad Knight of La Mancha. We would advise these irrepressible declaimers to profit by their first leisure and read a few chapters of some such book as the *Monks of the West*, the *Christian Schools and Scholars*, the *Ages of Faith*, or even *Maitland's Dark Ages*; and before they commit themselves to any further public utterances, we would

strongly recommend them to read something about De la Salle's methods and educational triumphs.

It was in 1699 that the Sunday courses were begun; but long before this epoch-making date the name of De la Salle had spread throughout the country. It finally reached the Court, and the Brothers found in Madame de Maintenon a generous patroness. The Grand Monarque himself took notice of the growing institute, and in 1690 gave a remarkable proof of the esteem in which he held the illustrious priest and his society. The episode is of historic interest. After the defeat of the Boyne, James II. withdrew to France, whither many of his gallant officers, after vainly trying to retrieve their losses, followed him. Louis XIV. appreciated their fidelity to their fallen king, and provided for them and their children in a princely manner. He confided their daughters to an illustrious Sisterhood, and proposed to give their sons positions in the army. But these noble exiles were only imperfectly acquainted with the customs and language of their adopted country; they required instruction and refinement before being introduced to society and presented to Court. Louis XIV. consulted eminent authorities, and was advised by them to intrust the noble little band to the Abbé de la Salle. The worthy priest saw in the demand an expression of the designs of Providence that the time had come to extend the usefulness of his society, and accordingly he hastened to open a boarding-school. The hopeful young Irishmen, fifty in number, were warmly received, and soon found a cheerful and comfortable home with the Brothers. De la Salle superintended their education, selecting his ablest masters to give them the instruction suited to their age and position; and so well did these teachers respond to the confidence placed in them that in a short time the young exiles were able to fill with credit, the various offices and posts of honor to which they were appointed. As may be expected, James II. took a lively interest in them. Accompanied by the Archbishop of Paris, he visited the school, and, delighted at seeing them so well cared for, testified his gratitude to M. de la Salle and to the Brothers in the most honorable terms.

It may seem that the opening of this boarding-school was due to purely adventitious circumstances. This is only apparently true. Such establishments formed an integral part of the system of education drawn up by De la Salle, and bequeathed to his successors. They were necessary to supply a great want. The extreme orders of society were now fairly provided for; a gap, however, separated the few, and it was the founder's intention to bridge it over as soon as he could by the creation of boarding-schools. To his other

merits he thus added that of giving a great stimulus to middle-class education.

We have just seen De la Salle considering the demand of Louis XIV. as an expression of the will of heaven. As a man of eminent piety and learning he was wont to see in the march of events the guiding hand of an ever-watching Providence. The spirit of faith was his compass, and it knew no variation. By its influence he interpreted events, one of which had lasting consequences for his institute. It seems to have been his intention from the outset that some of his disciples should take Holy Orders, so as to be the spiritual directors of their respective communities. But he proceeded slowly in order to proceed surely. He singled out from among his earliest followers a man of rare ability, whom he wished to prepare for the priesthood. But this promising subject was carried off by a premature death, and the designs of De la Salle frustrated. This sinister event was to him a warning from above, and he hastened to write in his rule that no member of his Congregation should aspire to the ecclesiastical state. This gave the new institute an essentially lay character, which was a departure from custom, and therefore an innovation. It was an innovation, however, that gave permanency to the Society, securing to it an order of talent that might eventually have been transplanted to other fields of labor. The Brother of the Christian Schools is thus the "pioneer of the various lay teaching Orders by which he is surrounded."

De la Salle was eminent not only for his piety, but also for his learning. Of this he gave repeated proofs in his dealings with the Jansenists. These wily sectaries frequently tried to entangle him in their meshes. They were warm in his praises, and affected great zeal for the development of his work. They even helped him to open a noviciate in Marseilles, and encouraged young men to enter. They at last fancied they had fairly entrapped the unsuspecting priest. They then agreed to a public conference, in which the points at issue should be discussed. Guarded at first in their expressions, they soon threw off the mask. They sneered at Mgr. de Belsunce—"Marseilles' good Bishop," as Pope calls him—and derided the orthodox doctrine. They pointed their arguments by referring to De la Salle, then present, as one of their own. He instantly rose to repel the charge, and "in language borrowed from the purest sources, and with an eloquence that the occasion created, he proved the fallacy of the position which he had just heard assumed. Never had he felt the importance of not being misunderstood more than on the present occasion, and never were his enemies worse confounded. They were surprised at his manly defence." Thus writes one of his biographers.

Not abashed by this public repudiation of their sect, the Jansenists tried other means to win over so influential a man to their party. They vainly offered him bribes, and tempted him with ecclesiastical dignities. Changing their tactics, they then endeavored to break up the noviciate and destroy the schools; but, failing in all these attacks, they determined to open their last battery. They printed a libellous pamphlet, and circulated it far and wide. They hoped to drive their enemy out of the city, his retreat being their triumph. But he boldly stood his ground and replied to their fire. This he owed to the faith he professed, as well as to the Brothers of his institute. "He, therefore," says his latest biographer, "prepared a memoir, in which, while speaking mildly of the character of his maligners, he tore their doctrinal errors to shreds. His victory was complete. His friends, who had known him principally because of his virtues, now found, to their great delight, that he was one of the ablest, though most modest, champions of the Church against the errors of Jansenism and its hypocritical followers."

Soon after this, Clement XI. issued the famous Bull *Unigenitus*, which crushed Jansenism under its latest form of Quietism. De la Salle read and explained the document to his Brothers, and published an elaborate defence, which again drew down upon him the wrath of the irritated sectaries.

It had long been his ambition to go to Rome and solicit in person from the Holy Father canonical recognition for his new Order. While yet residing at Marseilles he determined to avail himself of a favorable opportunity, and secured a berth on board a ship bound for Civita Vecchia. He had even gone down to the quay, and was on the point of embarking, when he perceived Mgr. de Belsunce hastening towards him. A good opportunity of opening a new school had just occurred, and the great bishop urged the importance of not neglecting it. De la Salle acquiesced; and, returning home, humorously said to his astonished community: "Behold me back from Rome!"

He had already founded a house in the Eternal City, and intrusted its direction to one of the most prominent men among his earliest disciples. He was cordially attached to the Holy See, and ever wished to show his loyal submission to the successor of Peter by signing himself *Roman priest.*

We have now briefly alluded to the leading events in De la Salle's life, and endeavored to sketch the bolder creations of his genius. And genius he unquestionably had, whether we give the term its usual meaning or define it as "the infinite power of taking pains." He was original in his conceptions, and considered no detail too minute that might in any way contribute to the harmo-

nious development of his plans. He foresaw everything, calculated his chances, and confidently abided his time. His life is an illustration of the saying, "To know how to wait is the great secret of success." His amiable manners and intelligent energy triumphed over difficulties before which many of a more herculean mould would have failed. He organized his Society with rare tact and sagacity, so much so that De Bonald, speaking of his code of rules, calls it a "masterpiece of wisdom and knowledge of men." For forty years he led the educational movement in France; he identified himself with it, and became one of the glories of the great age in which he lived. After four decades of unwearied labor, after firmly establishing his Order, this great and good man went to his heavenly reward. He died at Rouen, April 7th, 1719, in the sixty-eighth year of his age. Posterity has classed him among the benefactors of humanity, his country has raised his statue,[1] and the Church, mindful of his virtues and heroic sanctity, has conferred upon him the title of Venerable.

The grand work of the Venerable de la Salle continued to prosper down to the time of the Revolution. The men of 1789, who spared no one in their blind fury, imprisoned some of the Brothers and scattered the rest. But Italy kept alive the sacred fire; the Communities of Orvieto and Ferrara escaping the proscription of the French army, and thus maintaining the unbroken continuity of the institute. In 1806 Napoleon re-established the Society by imperial decree, pointedly remarking to those who discountenanced the measure: "I do not know what sort of fanaticism some persons manifest against the Brothers; everywhere I am asked to re-establish them. This general cry shows their utility. The least that Catholics can expect is equality: and certainly thirty millions of men deserve as much consideration as three millions."[2] Since that period the Order has steadily progressed and wonderfully developed. It is now no longer confined to its native country. It has crossed the seas, and its beneficent action is felt in almost

[1] This magnificent monument, erected in Rouen, was unveiled with national splendor and ceremony in June, 1875. It represents the Venerable de la Salle in a pleasing attitude, with all his grace and benignity; it shows the arms of his noble house, of his institute, of Rheims and of Rouen. One of the bas-reliefs represents him in the act of distributing his patrimony to the poor, whilst another commemorates the visit of James II. The corners are held by children, who typify the four quarters of the earth, and from the base gush forth limpid streams, which symbolize the instruction plentifully poured out on the four parts of the globe by the Venerable de la Salle and his disciples.

[2] "Je ne conçois l'espèce de fanatisme dont quelques uns sont animés contre les Frères. Partout on me demande leur retablissement; ce cri général démontre assez bien leur utilité. La moindre chose qui puisse être demandée pour les Catholiques, c'est sans doute l'égalité, car trente millions d'hommes meritent autant de consideration que trois millions."

every land. The Order speaks all tongues. Instance the "heathen Chinee" in the language of Confucius; Arabic in Alexandria, and modern Greek in the streets of Constantinople. It is truly cosmopolitan. Faithful to the spirit of its founder, it directs parochial schools and academies, training schools and colleges. It numbers 14,000 members, and we are glad to learn that the bulk of this phalanx has for years been engaged in the battle of religious education against secularism and infidelity. France, and especially Paris, has been the theatre of this long struggle, as it is at the present hour of a fierce and desperate onset. All credit to the Brothers, who have never wavered, never blanched in the fight. Over and over again they have met their antagonists in the lists of public competition, and *as often* have they worsted them in the strife. They have never declined a combat, never lost a victory.

COMPETITIVE EXAMINATIONS.

YEAR.	SCHOLARSHIPS.	BROTHERS.		SECULARS.	
		SCHOLARSHIPS.	AMONG FIRST 20.	SCHOLARSHIPS.	AMONG FIRST 20.
1848	31	27	17	4	3
1849	32	31	20	1	0
1850	32	24	17	8	3
1851	40	28	15	12	5
1852	40	33	18	7	2
1853	40	31	15	9	5
1854	40	32	17	8	3
1855	40	32	17	8	3
1856	40	36	17	4	3
1857	40	36	20	4	0
1858	40	38	19	2	1
1859	40	34	18	6	2
1860	40	34	17	6	3
1861	40	35	17	5	3
1862	40	31	15	9	5
1863	40	34	17	6	3
1864	40	30	15	10	5
1865	40	37	19	3	1
1866	40	29	17	11	3
1867	40	35	16	5	4
1868	40	38	20	2	0
1869	50	30	14	20	6
1870	50	41	17	9	3
Lycées	40	28	15	12	5
1871	50	33	16	17	4
1872	50	36	16	14	4
1873	50	32	16	18	4
1874	80	64	19	16	1
1875	80	55	14	25	6
1876	80	67	19	13	1
1877	100	77	18	23	2
1878	100	83	18	17	2

We have gone to some trouble to obtain the foregoing details of the open competitions for the scholarships annually given away by the city of Paris, and we are glad that we have succeeded. Their publication is all the more opportune as the municipal authorities of Paris have just decided to turn the Brothers out of their schools. We commend these figures to the notice of all who take any interest in the educational question, but more especially to those who think that religious teaching should be banished from the classroom.

The table speaks for itself. It is a glorious refutation of the aspersions and calumnies thrown out by the partisans of a godless education. The logic of such figures is telling. Thirty-one contests and thirty-one victories! Then again out of 1545 scholarships, 1231 (the lion's share) are won by the Brothers, leaving a balance of 314 to their opponents. The success is overwhelming. It places beyond cavil the superiority of the "clerical" schools, a superiority due in part to the masters and in part to their methods.

In the light of such facts we can well understand the praises bestowed on the Brothers by two great statesmen *inter multos*. One of these is Guizot. "I rejoice," says the historian of civilization, "to see the Brothers engaged in the work of education; by their devotedness, by their science, by their methods they will give a powerful impetus to true progress. Our industrial, artistic, and commercial classes will here find all the knowledge they require for their various careers in life."[1] Now hear Thiers: "For many years I have been a supporter of the University, a systematic supporter. Well, I declare to-day that I would wish to see the Brothers not only in our cities, but in all our country towns and villages."[2]

To the above we shall add just one testimony, viz., that of the London *Times*. It writes: "It would be difficult to find a body of men more self-sacrificing and better able to fulfil the task they have undertaken than the Brothers. Their affable ways, their excellent discipline, their talent for education, their thorough devotedness to their work commend them to the respect and admiration even of Protestants."

---

[1] "Je me rejouis de voir les Frères des Ecoles Chrétiennes dans le ministère de notre éducation; par leur dévouement, par leur science, par leur enseignement, ils donneront le branle au véritable progrès. Nos générations industrielles, artistiques et commerçantes trouveront ici tous les aliments intellectuels qui conviennent à leur vie, à leur destinée."

[2] "J'ai été longtemps universitaire, systématiquement universitaire. Eh bien, je déclare aujourd'hui que je voudrais voir les Frères non pas seulement dans les villes, mais aussi dans tous les bourgs et tous les villages."

But the oft-defeated secularists differ *toto cælo* in opinion from Guizot, Thiers, and the *Times*. Their hopeless failures kindled their wrath and fanned it into flame. They cudgelled their brains for some means of putting down the Brothers, and at last they hit upon a plan, which to their mind must infallibly strip their irrepressible rivals of their prestige, and ultimately sound the death-knell. They cried out that the Brothers crammed their best boys, to the detriment of the less promising, and they confidently appealed to the University to inquire into the matter. The University did inquire into the matter by applying a test in the shape of a *Certificat d'Etudes* granted to all deserving scholars. The efficiency of a school was of course to be measured by the number of such certificates obtained. The first examination of the kind was held in 1869, on which occasion the Brothers simply doubled the average of the secular teachers. Similar results were obtained each succeeding year, as the following table shows:

QUALIFYING EXAMINATIONS.

YEAR.	CLERICALS.		SECULARS.	
	CERTIFICATES.	AVERAGE PER SCHOOL.	CERTIFICATES.	AVERAGE PER SCHOOL.
1869	274	5.48	177	2.76
1870	419	7.76	264	4.06
1872	471	8.72	341	4.94
1873	421	7.80	322	4.35
1874	601	11.13	483	6.35
1875	711	13.17	593	7.32
1876	692	12.81	656	7.63
1877	687	12.72	755	8.67
1878	780	14.44	852	8.78

The University test, which was intended to show up the tricks of the Brothers and mathematically demonstrate the inferiority of their schools, thus defeated the hopes of its framers. It served only to make more patent and to give greater publicity to the marked superiority of the Christian schools. But if the secular teachers were everywhere checkmated, the partisans of secularism

—irate at their complete discomfiture—resolved to make a combined effort to repress their troublesome rivals. Unable to cope with them in the lists, unable to meet them in fair open fight, they have at last resorted to the *argumentum ad baculinum*, to brute force. The municipal council of Paris has already voted their expulsion, and several provincial towns have emulated the capital. At Blois and a few other places they have been literally ejected by the *gens-d'armes*. But the people stood by the instructors of their children, and on the very morrow of their ejection they were able to hold their classes in new premises, the scholars, to a boy, rallying round their persecuted masters. But this is not all. While ediles decree their suppression, deputies are busy contriving a piece of legal machinery (the scavenger's daughter of the nineteenth century) which will not merely hamper but effectively cripple and crush the offensive Brotherhood. While we are going to press these warm friends (?) of liberty are engaged upon a schedule to subject the Brothers to military service. If this bill pass the Chambers the cassock will have to be thrown aside for the uniform, and the school abandoned for the barracks. Such a measure, we have reason to think, would be productive of disastrous results for the main body of the institute.

We consider the fiery ordeal through which the Brothers in France are now passing as one of the finest pages in their history. We certainly admired their bravery on the battle-field which forced a general to cry out to them that humanity and charity did not require them to venture so far, and induced another to dismount in order to embrace one of them whom he met under the enemy's guns; we certainly admired the retiring modesty they displayed when the French Academy awarded them the prize offered by the city of Boston for the noblest deeds of patriotism accomplished during the Franco-Prussian War; and we admired them again the other day when they went up to receive from the chief of the State the rewards they had won at the Paris Exhibition, viz., five gold, five silver, and three bronze medals; but we say without hesitation that they appear to us more worthy of admiration now on account of the persecution which their brilliant scholastic results have brought down upon them. It is because they are the leaders of popular education, because they are too successful, because they totally eclipse the secularists that they are marked out for destruction. They must now expiate their grand educational triumphs. It is here their death-warrant is signed, but it is equally true that *quos deus vult perdere, prius dementat*. That the demagogues are demented few will deny, who read our daily papers. They are infuriated against what they disdainfully call "clericalism," and

resort to excessive measures to check and extirpate it. They forget the warning which one of their own conveys to them in the line,

Le trône a succombé par excès de puissance.

They never cease talking about liberty and the era they are inaugurating; but their liberty is a grinding tyranny. Their excesses will be their ruin.

But while the Order is persecuted in France, it continues to extend and prosper in other countries. Spain has just welcomed its first colony of Brothers, and the Moslems of Jerusalem have shown no aversion to their sable costume. In England they scarcely muster a hundred members, and yet have several extensive establishments. In Liverpool they have taken out government certificates, and the Blue Books show that Her Majesty's inspectors give them excellent reports. In London they have a college where young men are prepared for public examinations, and especially for the University of London.

It is only thirty years since the first pioneers of the Order came over to our shores, and already there are over 1200 Brothers scattered throughout the country from Hudson's Bay to the Gulf of Mexico, from New York to San Francisco. Here, as in France, they devote themselves with energy to their great and laborious work, and it is gratifying to notice the marked success that everywhere attends their efforts.

The Order thus continues in every clime its grand educational traditions, and in every land reaps the same harvest of results. We cordially say *floreat semper.*

RECENT PROGRESS IN STELLAR PHYSICS.

AS a witness of unparalleled progress in all sciences, especially those which are termed experimental, the present century stands pre-eminent. No proof of this assertion is demanded, for the astounding progress of the age has become so trite and commonplace an expression that it is in every one's mouth. What giant strides in the science of the day do not steam and electricity mark? Our fathers in their boyhood days felt not the absence of these two useful agents; but how could we survive their loss? Photography, too, and the thousand discoveries in modern chemistry as applied to the arts and to agriculture, manifest the wonderful advance of science.

Astronomy, likewise, in its experimental features, can boast of following, or I should say rather of leading other sciences in the onward march of progress; a superiority due, in no slight degree, to the perfection and ingenuity exhibited in our modern instruments of celestial research. To mention a few familiar facts will be a sufficient voucher for the statement. Since the year 1800, when Piazzi discovered the first, all that group of celestial bodies termed asteroids, forming, according to Bode's law, the "missing link" between the planets Mars and Jupiter, has been added to our store of astronomical knowledge. In the Smithsonian Report for 1876 the number of these dwarf planets noted up to that date is given as 172; the last, if I mistake not, discovered in July by Professor Peters, of Clinton, N. Y., is the 200th in the list.

Again, the mathematical prophecy by Leverrier of Neptune's existence, and its subsequent discovery are familiar to all our readers. Then there is Professor Hall's discovery of Mars's satellites in August, 1877; and Professor Watson's glimpse of at least one intra-mercurial planet obtained on July 29th, 1878. Tables, also, of all the planets, together with that of our own satellite, have been carefully compiled, studied, and corrected. Besides, the periodical nature of comets has been ascertained, and the time of revolution of several of these erratic wanderers from the influence of other solar centres has been calculated and confidently predicted.

But to approach nearer our subject—the stars; in stellar astronomy, as distinct from astronomy in general, important results have been reached. Very correct stellar charts or maps have been completed after a careful and laborious study of ancient and modern catalogues; the most renowned among the latter being Lalande's, Argelander's, Rümker's, Baily's, Airy's, Weisse's, Groombridge's, Johnson's, Carrington's, and Santini's. The distribution of the stars has been more exactly studied, and their number com-

puted with greater accuracy by the two Herschels and their successors in that study; so that the best authorities state that by the help of our most powerful instruments more than 20,000,000 of the stellar orbs have been rendered visible.

The ancients regarded the stars as literally fixed; modern research has ascertained that many, perhaps all, have a certain motion. This motion is small, in an angular direction, many stars describing an arc of only 1″ per annum, and none ever exceeding 6″ or 7″. It is more apparent for large than for small stars, so that the opinion hitherto advanced, that the smaller stars appear so by reason of their greater distance, acquires hereby additional probability.

Since 1802, when William Herschel first announced the existence of physical systems of double stars (*i. e.*, systems of bodies connected as the planets are with the sun, and acting on each other according to Kepler's laws), their number has been greatly augmented, nearly 6000 being so far enumerated. Some may belong to the class of optical double stars, *i. e.*, stars which are near only in appearance, being in reality far apart and independent of each other.

The variable stars, whether periodical or temporary, have not evaded the sweeping research of the astronomer. The nebulæ, too, have been attentively examined and many of this class resolved into distinct stars. This study has, furthermore, revealed the fact that the nebulæ change their original shape, as Professor Holden asserted some years since with regard to two of them.

To attempt a detailed account of the several subjects touched upon, and of those whose enumeration has been omitted for the sake of brevity, would far surpass the limits of an article. Besides many of them are so involved in technicalities as to lose all interest for the general reader. Let us, then, select a subject to which we have not hitherto alluded, namely, that field of astronomy first entered upon about a quarter of a century ago, when the then newly invented spectroscope inaugurated the science of stellar physics. We propose, therefore, to lay before the readers of the American Catholic Quarterly Review as plain an exposition of the progress resulting from the application of that wondrous little instrument to the far-off heavenly orbs, as the subject-matter will permit.

In this branch of astronomy, which is essentially experimental, it is requisite from the start to distinguish between well-ascertained facts and the theories built thereupon. The established facts constitute the bulwark of the science, while the theories resting upon these and deduced from them are liable to change; as in chemistry the discovery of new facts has often sounded the signal for the suppression of some pet theory which failed to meet their explanation. It should be remarked, however, that where mechanical principles

are involved the theory remains thus far intact, since these principles are as certain as the facts themselves.

Now the spectroscope brought to bear upon the stellar world gives us a glimpse of these bodies which enables us to point out a solid, a liquid, or a gaseous star. It registers their relative temperature, measures the tension of their atmospheric vapors, singles out the component elements which constitute them, and lastly detects their backward or forward motion in the direction of the visual ray. A motion which, when exactly measured and compared with the angular motion mentioned above, will disclose to us a satisfactory knowledge of the nature of the stellar orbits.

But how does the spectroscope lead us to this knowledge?

Before answering this question we deem it not out of place, first to offer the general reader a hurried description of the instrument, which has so vastly enriched our astronomic lore, together with a hint regarding the way in which it is employed, and then glide rapidly over the steps leading to our present knowledge of stellar spectroscopy. An ordinary spectroscope comprises essentially three parts; a collimator, serving to render the beam of light parallel, one or more prisms, and a telescope designed to examine the dispersed light or spectrum. Direct view spectroscopes combine these parts in one straight tube, the prism being replaced by two prismatic systems so arranged that one set counteracts the deviation caused by the other, without affecting in the same manner the dispersion. Either kind, or a combination of the two, serves also for a stellar spectroscope; these last, though, are supplied with a powerful telescope to increase the intensity of the light. It is likewise found necessary to employ a cylindrical lens, otherwise the spectrum of a star would be a mere line, since any so-called fixed star, even in the field of the most powerful telescope, appears as a point. With the cylindrical lens the difficulty is obviated; the spectral colors as well as the dark bands being sufficiently widened and separated for detection. How simple an apparatus to accomplish the wondrous achievements indicated above!

With regard to its employment, let us remark that compound light like compound sound, to which it is comparable, contains several elementary vibrations which by their superposition form the compound beam. When such a beam of light passes through a prism it is deviated; the red the least, the violet the most; between these the other colors are located. This constitutes what is termed a spectrum. Now when we examine an incandescent solid or liquid body the spectrum is continuous. Gases under ordinary conditions give a band spectrum, termed direct band spectrum. If a metallic vapor be interposed between a spectroscope and a luminous source much hotter and brighter than the vapor, and also capable of pro-

ducing a continuous spectrum, then some of the light of the continuous spectrum will be absorbed, and the spectrum given will contain dark lines perpendicular to its length. A familiar example of this absorption spectrum, containing the well-known Fraunhofer lines, is that given by the sun.

This able experimenter, by whose name the lines of the solar spectrum are known, was the first to obtain spectra of the heavenly bodies other than that of the sun. He produced spectra of the moon, planets, and comets, which reflect sunlight, and announced them to be of the same kind as the solar spectrum; this assertion subsequent experiments fully substantiated. A slight dissimilarity, however, has been lately detected in the spectrum of Uranus and the comets. Fraunhofer also noted dark lines in the spectra of the stars, and observed that they were differently located from those in the solar spectrum. Others zealously followed in the steps of Fraunhofer, but satisfactory results were not obtained until Huggins, Miller, and the late Fr. Secchi, S. J., took the subject in hand. The work of the first is remarkable for delicacy and accuracy of detail. The labor of the lamented Jesuit embraced a more numerous collection of stars. Some ten years ago Schellen spoke thus of these pioneers in stellar chemistry: "When it is remembered that the light of the stars, and especially that of nebulæ and comets, is very faint, and that in a northern climate there are but few nights favorable for the observation of these delicate objects, in which their light is neither overpowered by the moon nor obscured by mist or cloud; and when it is further borne in mind that, since the instruments participate in the daily revolution of the earth, a complicated driving clock is requisite for giving them a contrary motion, by which the image of a star may be kept stationary for some time in the field of view; some idea may be formed of the difficulties inseparable from the investigations of the heavenly bodies by spectrum analysis, and some proper estimate made of the services of such men as Angelo Secchi, director of the Observatory at the Collegio Romano at Rome; William Huggins, of Upper Tuke Hill; and William Allen Miller, Vice-President of the Royal Society, who have won for themselves well-merited honor by their untiring zeal and energy in overcoming so many obstacles." Before his death, Fr. Secchi had classified the spectra of 4000 stars. Fr. Ferrari, Fr. Secchi's disciple and successor, was continuing this laudable work when the Italian Government removed him from the observatory.

Numbers have devoted their energy to the prosecution of this study; but as a classification of stellar spectra in types, "which," as Lockyer remarked in a lecture before the Royal Institution of Great Britain, "has been indicated by Fr. Secchi with admirable

philosophy," sums up the general facts pertaining to this subject, we shall endeavor to reproduce it in substance, as found in his last work, *Le Stelle*, 1878.

The spectra, he remarks, of the majority of the stars thus far accurately examined with the spectroscope can, with few exceptions, be reduced to four general types. The first comprises the spectra of *α Lyræ*, *Sirius*, the most brilliant star in the heavens, and most of those which shine with a white or bluish-white light, such as *Vega*, *Regulus*, *Rigel*, and the stars of the Great Bear except *α Ursæ*. To this type belong more than half of the visible stars. The spectra of this class exhibit the seven colors, the yellow and red being somewhat faint when the bluish light predominates. They are crossed at times by several dark lines; four, which are always present, being quite broad, correspond to the four brightest lines (H, $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$) in the spectrum of hydrogen as produced by means of Geissler tubes. A few of the brightest stars, as *Sirius*, besides these characteristic lines, exhibit in their spectra lines easily detected corresponding to the metals sodium, iron, and magnesium.

The spectra of the second type resemble that of the sun. The stars belonging to this group, such as *Arcturus*, *Capella*, *Pollux*, *Aldebaran*, *α Ursae*, and *Procyon*, are numerous and of a yellow tint. In their spectra the lines are quite fine, requiring a very pure atmosphere to insure their detection. Lines corresponding to hydrogen are observed, but are not so heavy and prominent as those given by the first type. It should be remarked that these lines undergo a change in intensity with the variation of color in the stars, being darker and longer, for instance, in *Arcturus* and *Aldebaran* during their florid period than at other times; the sodium line also becoming less well defined. Moreover, the spectra of these stars seem at times to pass into those of the third type.

To the third type belong about one hundred stars of the first and second magnitudes. Of this group, *α Orionis*, *β Pegasi*, and *α Herculis* are examples. The spectra of these stars, which are mostly red, appear like a row of columns illuminated from the side, producing a pleasing stereoscopic effect; when the bright bands become narrower, then the dark lines take the appearance of a series of grooves. The lines of absorption in these spectra are rather bands than lines; those of hydrogen, however, remain faint, and are at times wanting, while the sodium, iron, and magnesium lines are well marked. The spectra of this group appear to be double, one comprising ill-defined luminous bands or columns over which a second containing dark metallic lines is projected. In some, these dark lines are readily distinguishable, in others they are seen with difficulty. The spectra of this type resemble those of the solar spots.

The last type, which comprises stars not exceeding the sixth

magnitude, exhibits considerable variety. The spectra are column-like in appearance, as those of the third type, but differing from them in this, that these fluted columns are more luminous on the violet side, while the greatest intensity is found on the red side in those of the third group. In some spectra, however, of this type, the bands are uniformly illuminated; in others, here and there, bright lines are noticed. A singularity in these spectra is the presence of a yellow line not coinciding with the D line of sodium. Some idea of the spectra of the third and fourth types is presented by a Geissler tube filled with nitrogen under low pressure, through which the electric spark at a medium temperature is passed, a series of layers being produced resembling the columns alluded to.

The most remarkable exceptions of stars not reducible to these types are *γ Cassiopeiae* and *β Lyrae*, which give a direct spectrum of bright lines similar to that obtained in the laboratory by examining a glowing gas with the spectroscope.

Such are the leading facts which the spectroscope teaches us regarding the single stars; later on we may find space to mention those pertaining to double and variable stars; the shifting of certain lines in the spectra of the stars may also claim our attention.

But let us return to the question proposed above. How does the spectroscope acquaint us with facts belonging to these heavenly bodies? The stellar light, like a faithful messenger, conveys to us news regarding those distant orbs, but the message is couched in a strange tongue, which we must strive to interpret. As the aerial telegraph of old transmitted information afar which could be understood if conventional signs were known; so in the present case we must confer with nature and study her symbols before we can penetrate the secrets of her starry worlds. In experimental sciences we proceed from the more known phenomena to an explanation of those which are involved in obscurity or encompassed with difficulties. This shall be our method of procedure here, our knowledge of the sun giving us the clue to explain the meaning of the bands and lines noticed in stellar spectra. This method is perfectly legitimate, since there is no sharp line of demarcation between our sun and the stars; the sun being a star towards which gravitate the planets, their satellites, and numerous comets,—a star, too, which, with its attendant worlds, travels through space as the so-called fixed stars. Only the general direction of the solar orbit through the heavens is known to us, yet this motion becomes daily more probable, and it has been lately suggested that the pendulum may afford us a mathematical demonstration of it, as it does of the earth's rotation.

Relatively the sun is a small star, according to the estimate of some astronomers, being only of the sixth magnitude, and its

distance, ninety odd millions of miles, is not great when compared with the distance of the nearest stars, which are estimated to be twenty millions of millions of miles from the earth. It presents an appreciable diameter and hence favors observation. Now, direct observations made on the sun with telescopes and other instruments yield results which harmonize perfectly with those which the spectroscope discloses when directed on the same body. Thus when Galileo directed his telescope upon the solar disk it revealed to him the well-known sun-spots. To explain these phenomena various theories were advanced, but astronomers were finally led to regard them as cavities existing in the solar atmosphere; now the spectroscope brought to bear on these spots leads to identically the same conclusion. Again, it has been ascertained by direct experiment with the telescope that the sun is a periodical star, varying at intervals of about eleven and a half years; these periods, which have a close connection with many changes on our globe, can be ascertained by the use of the spectroscope. Here, then, we have a clue to the explanation of phenomena attending other variable stars.

In summing up the facts which the spetroscope reveals regarding the sun, it is advisable to distinguish, with Lockyer, two epochs. During the first, which terminated about ten years ago, solar phenomena were examined as a whole; since that date, which marks the beginning of the second epoch, each phenomenon has been subjected to a separate examination. We will note briefly the progress made by pursuing the old method. From the time of Newton the solar spectrum excited the curiosity and claimed the attention of scientific men. Glimpses of the dark lines, so familiar at present, were caught by different investigators. To omit earlier labors, Fraunhofer, in 1814, drew up a map of six hundred lines, and announced his suspicion of some connection between the sodium line and a double black line which he observed in the solar spectrum. In 1841 Brewster had observed two thousand lines, and remarked the coincidence of certain lines with those given by a few of the metals; he also detected lines in the infra-red region of the spectrum, whilst Becquerel noticed similar lines in the ultra-violet. Kirchoff, in 1859, experimentally established the existence of a fixed connection between the lines produced in the spectra of different substances and those found in the solar spectrum. In an address delivered before the Berlin Academy he annunciated the law in the following terms: "I conclude, further, that the dark lines of the solar spectrum, which are not evoked by the atmosphere of the earth, exist in consequence of the presence, in the incandescent atmosphere of the sun, of those substances which in the spectrum of a flame produce bright lines

at the same place." Hence he verified in the case of light the law long known for heat, namely, that the absorbing power of a body is equal to its radiating power. But why this connection? Is there any physical explanation why a certain vapor, that of sodium, for instance, should absorb precisely that light which it emits? Undoubtedly there is, and Stokes advanced the subjoined illustration even prior to Kirchoff's statement: "That a body may be at the same time a source of light giving out rays of a definite refrangibility, and an absorbing medium extinguishing rays of that same refrangibility which traverse it, seems readily to admit of a dynamical illustration borrowed from sound. We know that a stretched string which, on being struck, gives out a certain note (suppose its fundamental note), is capable of being thrown into the same states of vibration by aerial vibrations corresponding to the same note. Suppose now a portion of space to contain a great number of such stretched strings, forming thus the analogue of a 'medium.' It is evident that such a medium on being agitated would give out the note above mentioned; while, on the other hand, if that note were sounded in air at a distance, the incident vibrations would throw the strings into vibration, and consequently would themselves be gradually extinguished, since otherwise there would be a creation of *vis viva*. The optical application of this illustration is too obvious to need comment." To show still further the evidence of this illustration, let us consider the results given by passing through the vapor of sodium white calcium light. The vibrations producing this light are of different rates, like the sonorous vibrations constituting a compound sound. Now let us suppose the vibrations of the vapor to be of one uniform rate; then all the vibrations of the calcium light will pass through unchanged save that one identical with the rate at which the vapor of sodium is vibrating; this will be arrested by the vapor, spread over an extensive surface, and consequently will be wellnigh extinguished. The light, therefore, which will pass through can no longer give the color absorbed by the sodium. Kirchoff's method in investigating was that of mapping out and then instituting a comparison between the lines of the solar spectrum and those of the spectra of various substances. We meet, however, with two serious difficulties, which have been happily surmounted by the exertions of various investigators. The first was the need of a natural scale of measurement, his own being arbitrary, by means of which the results obtained with different instruments were not easily compared. To Augström is due the credit of introducing a scale based upon the length of light waves. This he accomplished by comparing the spectrum obtained with a prism with one formed by diffraction. As the lengths thus

measured are independent of the instrument employed, we have at once a natural scale of the spectral lines. The second difficulty was the necessity of determining the effect produced on the solar beam by the absorption of the terrestrial atmosphere. Brewster and Gladstone both detected the fact of this absorption, but failed to determine the full extent of its influence. The subject was thoroughly investigated by Janssen from 1864 to 1866, who discovered that it was mainly due to the presence of aqueous vapor, and he determined its precise action on the spectrum.

Had stellar chemistry made no further progress than what we have indicated, still our knowledge of the sun and stars could not be termed meagre. We could, in fact, with this knowledge determine respecting the sun, as well as those stars whose spectra are similar to the sun's, that their mass, whether a solid, a liquid, or possibly a gas under great pressure, must be at a very high temperature; that their nuclei are surrounded by an atmosphere whose constituents we could discover, etc. Let us consider a moment the solar spectrum with its well-known Fraunhofer lines. If the position of these lines be compared with those of the metals—which can be done by allowing the sun's light to fall upon one-half of the slit of a spectroscope, while the other half receives the light from an incandescent metallic vapor—then an exact coincidence will be observed between the lines of some metals and those given by the sun, and this not only in position but also in width and intensity. In this way several metals, fifteen at least, among which iron is predominant, have been found to exist in the solar atmosphere in a gaseous state.

But science was not disposed to halt. The new method of examining each solar phenomenon singly was introduced, and this has gradually led to an explanation of the difference noted in the stellar spectra, and to a knowledge of the physical condition of the stars; such as their comparative temperatures, their backward and forward motion in the direction of the visual ray, etc. But let us examine more in detail the features of the new method of observation, which bear upon the solution of these questions. Circumstances attending the eclipse of August 18th, 1868, may be said to have inaugurated the new method. In many preceding eclipses, notably that of 1842, luminous flames or prominences were observed darting out around the moon at the moment of total phase. In 1868 several skilful observers proceeded to India with the avowed purpose of determining by means of the spectroscope the nature of these flames. Success, in a great measure, crowned their efforts. Janssen, among others, found that these flames were produced mainly by hydrogen. But as the moments for favorable observation during an eclipse are very limited, the sub-

ject in question could not be thoroughly investigated, and it was thought that the zeal of scientific observers would be constrained to abide the coming of another total eclipse. Janssen and Lockyer came to the rescue, and independently discovered a method of observing the prominences with the spectroscope in full sunshine. Lockyer, some years previously, had expressed the opinion that perhaps it was possible, and he actually succeeded in effecting it October 24th, 1868; while on the 26th of the same month it was announced in the French Academy of Science that M. Janssen had reached the same result the day after the eclipse.

M. Faye, the eminent French astronomer, in a communication to the same Academy (November 2d, 1868), expressed himself thus regarding the question of priority: "Instead of endeavoring to apportion and therefore weaken the merit of discovery, is it not wiser to attribute the whole honor without reserve to both of these investigators, who, separated by some thousand miles, independently reached the untangible and invisible by a method the most surprising perhaps which the genius of observation has hitherto devised?"

Since this ingenious method is the key to subsequent discoveries, it is necessary to dwell somewhat on its explanation. Now let us suppose the slit of a very dispersive spectroscope to be directed perpendicularly upon the sun's edge, so that one-half of it only extends over the solar disk; then a double spectrum will be produced; one, the ordinary solar spectrum, caused by the disk of the sun; the second given by that portion of the terrestrial atmosphere which is opposite to the other half of the slit, and which is illuminated by the sun's rays. In this last, over a faint solar spectrum, bright lines will be remarked, of which the most noticeable are those of hydrogen, especially the C line, and a line in close proximity to the sodium line D. This phenomenon is constantly observed when on clear days the sun's edge is examined with a powerful telescope furnished with a very dispersive spectroscope. The only deviation noticed is that the lines are occasionally longer and brighter than usual, at which times they are often accompanied by some lines of the metals, magnesium, titanium, iron, manganese, calcium, chromium, sodium, and barium. Now the reason why this layer of solar atmosphere ordinarily visible during eclipses (to which the name of chromosphere has been given) is apparent in the spectroscope and not in the telescope when the sun is shining, is because the light of the terrestrial atmosphere overpowers it in the telescope; but when a line of light admitted through a slit is decomposed by a system of prisms, as happens in the spectroscope, the length of the spectrum produced can be lengthened at pleasure by simply multiplying the number of prisms; and as

the quantity of light remains the same it is evident that the intensity must diminish. Such is the result in the case of compound light which illuminates our atmosphere; if, however, the light be homogeneous, as the hydrogen light existing in the sun's chromosphere, it is simply deviated from its original direction by dispersion, but not reduced in intensity. Hence the lines corresponding to the homogeneous light of the chromosphere retain their intensity and eventually overpower the faint light of the spectrum produced by the terrestrial atmosphere, they alone remaining visible.

This method, furthermore, enables us to examine daily the protuberances which correspond to the longer and brighter lines mentioned above. Close observation, made either by placing the spectroscope as mentioned above or with its slit tangential to the sun's edge, which position exhibits the prominences to better advantage, has disclosed the fact that the sun's limb, especially during the period of solar spots, is often surrounded by these protuberances. At times they are noticed directly over a spot; they are, besides, subject to rapid mutations.

These observations have attracted much attention, and their study has been promoted both here and in Europe by eminent astronomers, such as Lockyer, Secchi, Young, Huggins, Rayet, Respighi, etc., with great success. Two phenomena here demand our attention as calculated to throw light upon the different types of stellar spectra. The first is the shifting observed in the position of the lines in the spectrum of the chromosphere, notably the hydrogen line C, when great changes occur in the prominences. The second is the great increase in width of the same lines. Both phenomena are also observed, at least partially, in the sun's disk when a solar spot is examined by the new method. To obtain a better idea of these phenomena let us suppose the slit of a dispersive spectroscope, attached to a large telescope, to be directed upon a solar spot, so that the slit covers the umbra, the penumbra, and the nearer side of the solar disk; then the disk will produce the ordinary solar spectrum with the usual lines; the penumbra will give a spectrum of the same kind with enlarged absorption lines; while the umbra will form a like spectrum, but fainter, containing wider lines, and occasionally in the middle of these enlarged lines a very fine bright line will be perceived. To this thickening of the lines must be added the shifting of the dark lines from side to side. A correct understanding of these phenomena, the increasing in width and shifting of the lines in the above-mentioned spectra, will clear up many difficulties encountered in the study of stellar spectra. With regard, then, to the increase in the width of the lines, the researches of Plücker, Cailletet, Hittorf, Frankland, and others,

have shown that this phenomenon is due to a change in the pressure or temperature of gases. Hydrogen, for instance, with medium rarefaction gives its three characteristic lines (H, α, β, γ). With diminished pressure the least refracting line (Hα) disappears and the gas changes color. Under great pressure the lines increase in width and others make their appearance. Similar changes accompany a variation in temperature. Hence with a great pressure and a high temperature the hydrogen line spectrum is converted into a continuous one, resulting from the general widening of the lines. Now as absorption and radiation are proportional, it follows that a gas at a high temperature and under a considerable pressure will produce thick dark lines in its spectrum.

The foregoing facts furnish an explanation of solar spots, which are generally thought to be due to the absorption of light from the photosphere as produced by masses ejected from the interior of the sun.

These masses, when observed near the solar edge, take the form of flames, because they are then projected on a comparatively dark sky; but when observed over the luminous disk itself they produce absorption. Just as the sodium flame when interposed between the spectroscope and a dark background gives a bright yellow line, but a dark line is observed if the dark background be replaced by a luminous source.

Before applying these principles to the spectra given by the stars, it will be advisable to examine the displacement of the lines, notably the C hydrogen line in the spectrum of the solar spots. This displacement is attributed to the backward and forward motion of hydrogen gas in the direction of the visual ray. But why so? The analogous deportment of optical and acoustic phenomena furnishes the key to the explanation of this fact. It is found in acoustics that the tone of a sounding body is higher if the sounding body approaches the ear, and lower if it recedes, than the true tone of the body. A rough verification of this generally admitted theory, termed Doppler's principle, is readily remarked in the change of the tone of the whistle of a locomotive on moving towards or receding from us. The explanation is briefly this:

Under ordinary circumstances sound is propagated in air with a velocity of about three hundred and forty meters per second. Now suppose that a horseman, at the exaggerated speed of three hundred and forty meters per second, were to approach a sounding body, which is emitting four hundred vibrations per second, then the horseman's ear would receive twice four hundred vibrations, and the sound consequently would be raised to the octave. Hence the pitch of a sound will be raised or lowered proportionably to the speed with which one approaches the sounding body or recedes

from it. An analogous phenomenon is very striking in the phonograph, which raises or depresses the tone of the original notes sung into the instrument accordingly as the cylinder is rotated more or less rapidly. As the different vibratory rates in sound are accompanied by a change in pitch, so a difference of vibration in light motion produces the various colors. Since, however, the motion producing a change in the luminiferous vibration must be proportioned to the number of vibrations of different colors—four hundred and eighty billions for red, eight hundred billions for violet—this motion must be infinitely more rapid than that which can effect a change in the sonorous vibrations.

Doppler's principle, especially when applied to light, has been attacked by not a few, yet it seems to stand the test. It is true that Doppler's attempt to account for the variation of color in changeable stars on his principle, by supposing them to move towards or recede from us is inexact; for as there exist obscure rays beyond the red and violet, these colors on a change in the ether waves would assume those shades which would have disappeared for the red and violet respectively, so that the general color would remain unchanged.

But although this circumstance precludes the application of Doppler's principle where there is question of the total color of the star, still this cannot be said with regard to the change of position in the absorbing lines. The rapid motion of a star changes, in fact, the position of all the dark lines observed in its spectrum. For this motion rendering all the ether waves of the rays emitted from the star longer or shorter, modifies in the same way the waves of the absorbed light. It happens, therefore, that the dark lines are shifted towards the violet or towards the red according as the motion is forward or backward. Their intensity, however, remains the same. As to the verification of the principle in its relation to light, we may mention that it has been applied to the motion of the planets which approach the earth and recede from it at well-known rates. Besides, Fr. Secchi, Professor Langley, and others have applied it to the sun, one limb of which is approaching us and the other receding from us as it revolves on its axis. In both instances the displacement calculated, though small, subsequent observations verified.

Before examining the application of this principle to solar phenomena as made in the new method, let us return for a moment to the widening of the lines above-mentioned, and see how this phenomenon when resulting from the temperature is explained by the supporters of the theory of thermodynamics. According to modern views the most minute particles of gas are subject to a rapid to and fro motion, which increases with the temperature. The tem-

perature being high, each particle of the violently agitated gas produces a spectrum line, either bright by radiation, or obscure by absorption. Now the line actually observed being a resultant of all these elementary lines, which are shifted some one way some another, is wider than when the temperature is lower, for the shifting is then less. And when the lines increase in width the edges appear not so well defined as the middle portion. This explanation coupled with the fact that a denser gas must produce wider lines, satisfactorily accounts for the phenomenon of the increase in width. We may remark that the darkening of the lines arises from increase in pressure and thickness, while their ill-defined appearance is due to temperature.

Lockyer, accepting Doppler's principle as true when applied to the shifting of the lines in the spectra of rapidly moving gases, has measured the velocity of gaseous eruptions on the sun's surface. The gaseous masses thus raised have not only a rapid upward motion, but once raised they move like gigantic cyclones in the solar atmosphere. Both these motions, the upward and the lateral, similar to that of our winds, can be measured by Lockyer's method. The first by observing the spectrum of a spot whilst in the middle of the solar disk, the latter by observing that of a prominence near the sun's limb. If we observe a spot when in the middle of the disk, any upward motion is a motion towards us along the visual ray; we can, therefore, measure the velocity of gases in their motion by examining the shifting of the lines in the spectrum of a spot thus located. So in the same manner by observing the shifting of the lines produced by a prominence near the sun's limb, we can ascertain the motion of the gases producing it in the direction of the visual ray, which being tangent to the sun represents the lateral motion of the gases, like that of a cyclone in our atmosphere. By this method it has been found that the hydrogen in the sun has sometimes the wondrous velocity of several hundred miles a second.

Though these deductions met with some contradiction on their first announcement, eventually they have been fully indorsed by the most eminent astronomers, among whom may be mentioned Secchi, Huggins, Young, Respighi, Rayet, Ferrari, etc.

From the preceding, and from other features in the new method of spectroscopic observation—features which are here omitted either because too technical or not bearing directly on our subject—it has been deduced that the nucleus of the sun (regarding which nothing certain is known) is surrounded first, by a very luminous layer, termed the photosphere, which, from all indications, is quite thick and exceedingly mobile. A second, called the reversing or absorbing layer, subtending about two seconds of an arc, equal to about one thousand miles in thickness, incloses the

first. This second layer, which appears bright during eclipses, gives the Fraunhofer lines, which at times are observed to be enlarged towards the sun's limb. Outside the second layer, and apparently five times as thick, is the chromosphere layer, which is mainly composed of hydrogen and an unknown substance, by many termed helium, giving a line near that of sodium. Above the chromosphere is the coronal atmosphere, the principal constituents of which are hydrogen, and a second unknown substance giving the green line 1474 on Kirchoff's map. During late eclipses, particularly that of 1878, phenomena were observed which lead to the conviction that this gaseous atmosphere is surrounded by minute meteoric bodies, sometimes called meteoric dust, whose presence explains the coronal light surrounding the sun when obscured by the lunar disk. Whatever may be the nature of this last appendix of the sun, which some connect with the zodiacal light, it is certain that the layers surrounding the photosphere form a kind of grating which lessens in a measure the intensity of its light; and when somewhat thinned, either by the uprisings of the photosphere or by other causes, they give rise to the *faculæ*, or luminous points seen on the sun's surface, just as interior eruptions of gas by thickening this layer produce the spots by their absorption, as abovementioned.

The consideration of solar spectroscopic observations having taught us to interpret the language of the stars, we can return to the solution of the questions proposed in the beginning, and frequently alluded to in the preceding pages concerning stellar spectra. We shall begin our explanation from the second stellar type, because the appearance of this type being altogether similar to that of our sun, nothing further need be added regarding these stars, as the temperature and pressure of their gases must be about the same as for the sun.

In the first type considerable variety is noted. We remarked that the stars of this group, when examined with the spectroscope, present a spectrum bearing large ill-defined lines of hydrogen absorption, while but few metallic lines make their appearance; therefore their gaseous atmosphere must be subject to a higher temperature and a greater pressure than in the second group. Their absorbing metallic lines are also fewer, and often not easily detected, a phenomenon which Fr. Secchi attributed to the dense atmosphere through which the lines are seen. If we should admit, for the moment, Lockyer's late theory regarding the so-called chemical elements as founded on fact, the increase in the width of the lines should be explained by the high temperature of the gases surrounding the stars of the first group,—a temperature capable of decomposing the metals, which, according to him, are reduced

to simpler substances, especially to hydrogen. But, whatever be said on this point, it is evident that there exists no marked difference between the stars of the first and second groups. They gradually pass from one into the other.

A similar gradation or connecting link is noted between the other two groups. The stars of these third and fourth types give indications of a comparatively lower temperature than that to which those of the first and second types are subject, the temperature decreasing from the first to the fourth. The spectra of the third and fourth groups of stars are comparable, as stated above, to that of nitrogen; that is, they are fluted. This appearance, according to the recent researches of Frankland, Lockyer, and others, seems to be owing to the presence of compound bodies not raised to a high temperature. If, in fact, the electric spark be passed through a compound body without raising the temperature sufficiently to decompose it, the spectrum produced will be composed of fluted spaces or band lines. In this respect nitrogen behaves like a compound body. If the temperature increase while the spark is passing, then, at the moment of decomposition, the spectrum changes, and, as a rule, the spectrum of the metal present becomes predominant. This being the case, it may be asked what compounds give spectra resembling the spectra produced by the stars of the third and fourth types? Fr. Secchi found—and so far as we know at the present writing the result of his experiments has not been denied—that the spectrum of benzine, or, in general, of the carbon compounds, is similar to those given by these stars. It is next to impossible, however, to define which of the carbon spectra in particular corresponds to each star, as the appearances of the carbon spectra vary considerably under different circumstances. The main difference, however, between the spectra of the third and fourth types seems to be that those of the fourth are bright band spectra, while those of the third contain absorption lines. Admitting this distinction, we can regard the third type as made up of stars whose brilliant portion—the photosphere—is surrounded by compound bodies which, absorbing a portion of the stellar light, produce fluted spectra. These compound bodies could not be present were the temperature as high as it is in the stars of the first and second groups. The spectra of the fourth group show that the light of these stars arises principally from the radiation of compound gases, whose temperature, therefore, must be lower still than that of the preceding type.

The following is a brief explanation of these stellar types as given by Fr. Secchi: "The stellar spectra of the first and second types produce lines of metallic absorption like those of our sun. The spectra of the third and fourth types give, besides the metallic lines, others corresponding to gases, very probably to carbon

oxide, or some other carbon compounds, and therefore these stars must be subject to a lower temperature than that of the first two types."

We would arrive at the same conclusion in admitting Lockyer's opinion regarding chemical elements, because in this view compound bodies, when the temperature is raised, are decomposed into their constituent elements, and these, at high temperatures, would all be reduced to hydrogen or to a few elements. In this opinion the stars of the first group, since they are the hottest, are composed mainly of hydrogen. The sun and other stars of the second type are at a temperature at which metals exist, but not their compounds, these latter being found only in the cooler stars.

To conceive some definite idea of the temperature of the stars, let us remark, with Fr. Secchi, that compound bodies, such as calcium oxide, can exist even at the temperature at which platinum melts, since the lines of this oxide are observed in the lime crucibles employed for the fusion of platinum. Now, in the sun and in some of the stars, calcium exists in the metallic state, consequently the temperature of these bodies is higher than the melting-point of platinum, the most infusible of metals.

We cannot, therefore, help admiring the exactness of Newton's remarks, who, long before science had reached the results which we have indicated, spoke thus in his eleventh query regarding the stars; "Are not the sun and fixed stars great earths, vehemently hot, whose heat is conserved by the greatness of the bodies, and the mutual action and reaction between them, and the light which they emit, and whose parts are kept from fuming away, not only by their fixity, but also by the vast weight and density of the atmospheres incumbent upon them, and very strongly compressing them, and condensing the vapors and exhalations which arise from them?"

To render somewhat complete this brief sketch of what the spectroscope has revealed regarding the condition of the stars, we shall touch upon a few other points alluded to in the beginning. We stated that ordinary methods of observation had shown that many of the so-called fixed stars, perhaps all, have an angular displacement. This, however, does not represent the total stellar motion, for the entire motion can be regarded as twofold; one in the direction of the visual ray, to which the second is perpendicular. This second is given by the displacement above mentioned, not in absolute length, but in an arc of a circle, whose dimensions are unknown, because the distance of the stars is unknown. But spectroscopic observations on the Fraunhofer lines, as explained hitherto, give the true value of the first motion. This method, which Huggins and Secchi first applied to the stars, gives only the relative

velocity of the earth and of the star under examination. But from this we can pass to the relative velocity of the star and of the sun by making the necessary correction for the motion of the earth in its orbit. By this method, which meets with many difficulties in its practical application, Huggins has shown that *Sirius* and *Regulus* recede from the sun with a velocity of about twenty miles a second; that *Rigel's* and *Castor's* rate is nearly twelve; and that all the stars of the Great Bear, except α, also recede; while, on the other hand, this star and *Arcturus* approach at the rate of nearly forty miles per second; and *Vega*, α *Cygni*, α *Pegasi*, etc., also approach.

Fox Talbot has suggested the application of this method of discovering the velocity of the stars by the shifting of the lines in their spectra to some physical systems of double stars, with the view of determining their distance from us; at least when they have one common absorbing constituent in their atmospheres. If we observe a double star, the plane of whose relative orbit passes through or near the earth, and if by ordinary astronomical observations we can determine the points at which the tangents to the orbit of one star revolving around the other are parallel to the visual ray, then measuring the relative velocity of the two stars (which is the actual velocity at which one rotates around the other), we can calculate the dimensions of the orbit described, and having observed the angle subtended by it, we can deduce the distance of the double star from our own planet. The process is exact, but the difficulties to be encountered are appalling.

The spectroscope, furthermore, has solved a problem presented by some double stars, which for a long time somewhat puzzled astronomers. Many double stars when examined with the telescope were found to exhibit complementary colors. It was doubted whether these colors were real or due to an optical illusion. Now, on examining these stars with the spectroscope it was found that in some cases one star presented a spectrum in which there was absorption of one color, while the complementary of that color was absorbed in the spectrum of the second star. In other cases, one star has appeared nearly white, while in the other the blue and green were almost entirely cut off by absorption. Hence these last stars are, the one white, the other red; but by an optical effect of contrast one appears green, the other quite red, while in the first case the complementary color is the real color of the star.

Let us, in conclusion, make a few remarks pertaining to spectroscopic observations on the variable stars, both periodical and temporary. The most remarkable periodically variable star is *o Ceti*, also called *Mira*, whose period is 331 days, 8 hours. For about five months it is invisible to the naked eye; then in three months it reaches the brightness of a star of the second magnitude,

and afterwards gradually disappears. Examined by the spectroscope at its maximum brightness it is yellow, and can be classed among the stars of the third type; during its decline it becomes reddish, and preserves only a few very fine and quite faint lines. Two temporary stars have been discovered since the invention of the spectroscope, one in 1866 in the constellation of *Corona Borealis*, the other in 1876 in *Cygnus*.

Before the application of the spectroscope to the stars, they were examined simply to note their change in luminous intensity and color, only vague hypotheses being advanced to account for the variations. The spectroscope enables us to distinguish three classes. In some the variations, which are generally of short duration, are caused by the periodical occultation of opaque bodies; thus Algol, which appears very bright for two days, diminishes in intensity to the minimum in three hours, and, remaining at this point for seven or eight minutes, it again brightens up in three hours. Now during all these changes its spectrum varies only in intensity, remaining unchanged in character. Hence the variation seems to be due to meteoric clouds, which move with a uniform motion, and when interposed between us and the star diminish its intensity. In others, again, the variation arises either from the rotation of the star itself, thus presenting different sides differently illuminated, or from a periodical emission of interior vapors, which produce a phenomenon similar to the solar spots. From unknown causes, referred by many to electricity, the sun's activity is variable. The interior eruptions of vapors, which are seen under the form of protuberances, and which produce by their absorption the solar spots, reach a maximum every eleven and a half years. Now as the phenomena remarked in some temporary stars, *Mira* for instance, are similar to the solar spots, only more marked, they are attributed to a like cause. In the third class the periods are irregular and unknown, the variation being due to immense fires, whose cause is unaccounted for, though attributed by some to the shock of planets or comets impinging upon them. The spectroscope, in fact, discovers bright lines in the spectra of some temporary variable stars, which are indicative of sudden and extensive conflagrations. Huggins has found the temporary star discovered in 1866 to contain mostly burning hydrogen; while in that discovered in 1878 Cornu found magnesium, sodium, or helium.

The foregoing sketch of the work accomplished by the spectroscope, though quite incomplete, comprises the main points which it has revealed regarding the stars; we say regarding the stars, for it has made known many other facts more or less connected with the present subject, which brevity obliges us to omit. Thus it has rendered more evident that the scintillation of the stars is

a phenomenon of terrestrial origin, depending on the motion of our atmosphere. It has shown that some of the nebulæ, contrary to previous opinions, cannot be resolved into separate stars, as has been done for many; for their spectra having bright lines are indicative of glowing gases. It has revealed various new facts pertaining to comets, meteorites, etc. So that glancing back over what has been achieved by this small instrument, we are simply astounded at the progress made; and this progress will doubtless open up facts hitherto hidden, not only in stellar physics, but in other branches of science.

THE MORMONS.

MY rambles in the Rocky Mountains commenced in the year 1860, when, after a trip of about two months and a half across the plains, I was stationed at Camp Floyd, Utah, and there made my first acquaintance with Mormonism. The post was the one established by General A. S. Johnson when he entered the Territory in 1858, and was situated about forty-five miles south of Great Salt Lake City, in a flat sage-bush plain, with very few Mormon settlers in the immediate vicinity. Numbers of them, however, used to come to the post with vegetables and other articles to sell, and in an emergency once I had occasion to employ as a nurse in my family a Mrs. W., a most estimable woman, wife, and mother, whose excellent qualities and kind services will long be remembered. Of course the "peculiar institution" of the Mormon people was frequently touched upon in conversation, and it was remarkable with what tenacity the doctrine of polygamy was defended, and sometimes by even the women themselves. This, however, is not by any means universal, and good Mrs. W. did not hesitate to express herself against the doctrine, at the same time that she entertained the fear that W. (her husband) might be "counselled" to give another "mother" to her children, in which event she did not know what he would do. With the men I frequently discoursed, interlarding bargains for potatoes and turnips with theological discussions, and the price of vegetables was not unfrequently intermingled with the price of sins in the next world, quotations from Scripture, and the "prophecies" of *Joe Smith.* Many of them exhibited considerable knowledge of the Bible, and one honest fellow did not hesitate to quote it as authority for

the modern practice of polygamy, saying that the patriarchs of old, "the chosen of the Lord," were notoriously polygamists, and that the modern people of the Lord (the Latter Day Saints) were but doing what had been plainly sanctioned by the Almighty. It was in vain to plead a less barbarous age and a later dispensation. The Mormon disputant rather demurred to the idea of any advance in civilization, and claimed a later revelation still through Joseph Smith and Brigham Young. As they always implicitly relied upon this latest revelation to the "Lord's chosen people," I soon found that as no premises could be agreed upon the resultant logic did not amount to much, and all argument ended, as it but too frequently does on such subjects, by leaving the disputants more firmly fixed than ever in their original convictions.

But we were soon called upon to enter into transactions more important than the discussion of theological questions, or the status of the Latter Day Saints; for the news reached us by "pony express" of the fall of Fort Sumter and the commencement of the civil war. We waited with impatience for the arrival of the order recalling our garrison to the East to participate in the defence of an imperilled country. The long-expected and anxiously anticipated order did not reach us till late in the spring, having gone by mistake to California, and it was not until the 27th of July that the troops moved out in a long dusty column from the partially dismantled post on their twelve hundred miles march to the eastward. A large quantity of stores of all kinds had been accumulated at the post, and it became a matter of some importance to determine what disposition should be made of them, for many of the stores consisted of arms and ammunition, and as nearly all the public transportation had been sold by orders from the late Secretary (Floyd) these could not be transported East. To send them by contract freight would cost more than they were worth, even were there any certainty that they would reach their destination. The policy of permitting them to fall into the hands of the Mormons was questionable; for they had been brought into the country by an army sent to compel these people to acknowledge the authority of the Government, and now that the Government was threatened with a more formidable rebellion there was no attempt on the part of the Mormons to conceal their satisfaction, and no lack of "prophecies" on the part of their leaders, that the day of Mormon vengeance was come, and the doom of the unjust Government of the United States sounded. To turn these military supplies over to them therefore was to place arms in the hands of probable enemies. It was, therefore, decided to destroy the arms and ammunition, and hundreds of excellent rifles and millions of cartridges were ruthlessly committed to the

flames, much to the disgust of the Mormons, who made no concealment of their dissatisfaction. Threats came to our ears that we would not be permitted to leave the Territory without attempts being made to steal our animals, and as the Mormons were known to be adroit horse thieves, great precautions were taken during the first part of the march to prevent this threat from being carried out. A remarkable case had occurred when some troops left the Territory the year before, which will serve to demonstrate the necessity for these precautions. One of the officers owned a fast mare which had beaten in all the races which she had run, and her possession was coveted by the racing fraternity in the Territory. The owner was warned when he left Camp Floyd to keep a sharp eye on his mare. He took the precaution to provide a metal collar and chain fastened with a padlock, and one night in the cañon of the Timpañogos she was locked to a tree near the owner's tent, and placed under charge of a sentinel. The next morning she was missing and was never again seen by the owner.

As indicating the moral tone existing in the community I cannot do better than give an account of the subsequent history of this animal. The owner wrote back an account of his loss to one of the officers at Camp Floyd, and transferred his ownership to him if he could recover the mare. Inquiries were at once made through a *Gentile* merchant of Salt Lake City, Mr. D., who, on communicating with the celebrated *Danite* "Bill Hickman," soon found out where the mare was. Hickman was a notorious character, whose reputation as a horse thief and murderer was well known throughout the Territory. He was a member of a band in Utah known as "Danites," or the "avenging angels of the Lord," to whom was committed, according to popular rumor, all the bloody work of the Mormon priesthood. He communicated to Mr. D. with a great deal of apparent zeal the fact that he had discovered that the mare was in the possession of a band of horse thieves, and *thought* he could recover her, but it might cost some money. He was told to make the effort, and shortly afterwards reported that he had succeeded in getting possession of her after a great amount of risk and at considerable expense, the agent he had commissioned to *steal* her having been detected in the first attempt and threatened with death by the band if he renewed the effort; but he did renew it and succeeded, and the mare was now in Bill Hickman's possession. Of course every one will say she was at once turned over to the rightful owner; but justice was not quite so quickly administered in Utah, and when Mr. D. proposed to pay Bill Hickman for his trouble the latter brought in such a complicated and heavy bill of expenses as to foot up a good deal more than the intrinsic value of the animal, and it then became evident that the

whole matter was a trick, and it was more than suspected that Bill Hickman had held possession of the mare from the first, and was in fact either personally or by means of one of his gang the *original* thief. In any ordinary community the process for recovering the stolen property would have been very simple; but the Mormons were not an ordinary community, and there were complications about this case on which it would be unjust to Mr. Hickman to suppose he did not place a full value. Mr. D., the merchant through whom the negotiations took place, was a *Gentile*, that is, he was *not* a Mormon, and he contemplated converting all his available property into cattle and driving them the following spring to California for a market. Now a cattle merchant in that country is very much at the mercy of any enterprising individual quick in the use of a revolver and unscrupulous enough to use it over the vast waste which extends from the settlements of Utah to those of California; and, as Mr. Hickman told Mr. D. very plainly that he looked to *him* for the settlement of his "little bill," the latter knew very well that if any steps, legal or otherwise, were taken to recover the fast mare Mr. Bill Hickman's "pound of flesh" with compound interest would come out of his cattle the next spring on their way to California! He had therefore nothing to do but to report to the officer at Camp Floyd the condition of affairs, the price at which he could buy back his own property from the thief, and to beg him to take no other steps for its recovery, as in that event Mr. D.'s whole fortune would undoubtedly be sacrificed. Of course the owner of the mare declined to pay the exorbitant price, and Bill Hickman remained in quiet possession of the fastest racehorse in Utah!

The facts in the case came to my knowledge after my arrival at Camp Floyd, and when, shortly afterwards, the officer alluded to left the post he transferred his title to me, provided I could recover the animal without in any manner compromising Mr. D. Some time afterwards Bill Hickman paid a visit to Camp Floyd in company with a United States District Judge of the Territory, and I sought a personal interview with him, with the idea that under the shadow of judicial authority I could bring influences to bear which would induce him to give up the property. I have often laughed over the result of the interview and the keen business cunning displayed by Bill Hickman. With an air of the most perfect frankness he admitted that he had not the slightest title to the mare, and then went over the long story which I already knew in regard to the trouble and expense he had gone to in getting possession of her; how, with a mare and a colt, a pair of oxen, a cow and a calf, and I don't know what amount of money, he had bribed a man at the risk of his life to steal her; and that all he wanted of Mr. D. was to do what was fair, ending with, "and I know from your face, '*Cap*,' that *you*

would not ask anything else." This delicate compliment coming from one I had every reason to look upon as an unprincipled horse thief and murderer failed as an appeal to my principles of justice, and I tried to scare the man by referring to a legal process and the United States judge then on the ground. The result reminded me of the answer given by a Western hunter, who was asked on one occasion by what is called in the Western country "a Pilgrim" to ride out and *drive in* a bear, so that he, the Pilgrim, could get a shot at him, "Perhaps he won't drive worth a cent!" Bill did not scare "worth a cent," and the interview terminated very unsatisfactorily to me.

Determined, however, to leave no stone unturned to accomplish my purpose, I wrote a note to Mr. Hickman, asking him to send me an order for the mare, as it would "prevent trouble to all parties," hoping that this cloudy threat would have the desired effect. And it did, for in answer he sent me a very badly spelled and illy written note, in which he protested that all he wanted was "what was fair and square," and inclosed me, not *one*, but *two* orders for the property in dispute.

Now the reader will say "that *was* 'fair and square,' and now you will certainly get your property." But before jumping to this conclusion he must scan the orders, as I did. One of these was found to be an order for the mare in my favor *on Mr. D.;* the other was in favor *of Mr. D.* on Bill Hickman's brother-in-law, who had the mare in charge, so that to get possession I still had to work *through* Mr. D., whose property would inevitably be sacrificed by Bill Hickman and his band to get the full price of the stolen animal!

After this display of diplomatic acuteness I gave up in despair, and was obliged to acknowledge that in driving a bargain I could not compete with the sharp practice of a Mormon horse thief.

Another incident which occurred just as we were leaving Camp Floyd will serve to illustrate the temper of the people we were among. A few days before our departure a bugler in my battery deserted, taking my private horse with him. Our deserters were always cordially received and freely harbored by the Mormons, and if they brought any stolen property with them so much the better; for all such was looked upon as spoils from the Philistines.

I obtained information that the deserter had gone south and was supposed to be at the town of Springville, south of Lake Utah, in company with other deserters who had concentrated there. I therefore asked Colonel Cooke to send, the day we commenced the march, an officer with a party around by the south end of the lake to attempt to capture the renegades. This was done, and the party regained us at the mouth of the Timpañogos Cañon two days after-

wards, with my horse, which was captured. As the party approached Springville one of them, a corporal belonging to my battery, rode ahead, and representing himself as a deserter, easily obtained information from the Mormons where the deserters were located. He found several of them in a house, was gladly received, and told where to conceal his horse—in a large cornfield close by. He repaired to the place and pretended to prepare to leave his horse, but was startled by the sudden ringing of the church bells of the town. All the deserters immediately broke for the cornfield, and the corporal taking his own horse and leading mine, which he found amongst those concealed, joined his party. The ringing of the bells had undoubtedly been a prearranged signal between the Mormons and the deserters, and had the appearance of the main party been delayed for a short time all the deserters would probably have been captured. As it was they all escaped.

Under such circumstances we, of course, took every precaution against treachery; for, although the Mormon leaders were neither rash enough nor impolitic enough to attack us openly, there was no questioning they had the disposition to cripple us, and they would have effectually done so had they succeeded in running off our stock. We travelled and camped, therefore, with every precaution, and I did not go to bed a single night until we camped in the Narrow Echo Cañon, beyond which the danger was comparatively slight.

The day we passed through the cañon will long be remembered; for, as a party of officers rode along, the "pony express" was seen coming behind us from the direction of Salt Lake. The rider pulled up long enough to hand a printed slip to one of our number, and immediately started off again on a full run with his budget of news to the eastward.

We eagerly gathered around to hear the news read from the slip. It was the first telegraphic dispatch of the battle of Bull Run, fought ten days before. The information in that time had been telegraphed to Fort Kearney, which was then the western terminus of the line. From there it had been taken by "pony express" to Salt Lake City. There it was eagerly printed by the Mormon press on slips, and one of these the return "pony" had placed in our hands. The dispatch commenced by stating McDowell's preliminary movements, and went on to say that his troops carried everything before them, driving the rebel army, and we were all exulting over the result when the reader read off the last paragraph, by which we learned that our troops were seized with an unaccountable panic and had retreated in a disorderly mob on Washington. The sudden fall in the dispatch from a complete victory to a disastrous defeat was depressing in the extreme, and

such men as Buford (then a captain), who gave his life to the country two years afterwards, after reaching a higher grade in the service; Sanders (then a lieutenant and a Mississippian), who fell at Knoxville, gallantly fighting for the Union, as a general officer; and Merritt (also a lieutenant), who gained such reputation as a cavalry general in the war, gloomily discussed the question whether or not when we reached the end of our long seventy days' march we should find our Government in existence. Long and tedious days followed before we gained any further news, and what we did pick up from the trains of emigrating Mormons along the road was anything but encouraging. These new converts to Mormonism seemed to be fully impressed with the Utah spirit of hostility to the Government, and we were all grimly amused at the retort of a little Mormon urchin, who was driving a cow along with one of the trains, and with whom one of the officers attempted to joke about Mormonism and Brigham Young. "Look out for yourselves," he replied; "*Beauregard* is waiting for you down the road!"

We reached Fort Leavenworth on the 8th of October, however, without interruption either from the Mormons or the representatives of Beauregard's cause, who, according to the rumors we heard as we neared the eastern terminus of our march, were to attack us by an expedition from the State of Missouri.

Thus terminated for a time my rambles in the Rocky Mountains and my studies of Mormonism. The former were resumed after the war, in 1867, and the latter two years later, in 1869, when I took command at Camp Douglas, a post about three miles from the centre of the city, and situated on a bench overlooking and commanding the whole place.

No one could fail to be impressed with the change which eight years had wrought in the surrounding circumstances. The Pacific Railroad had been completed, and the distance from the Missouri River to the Valley of Salt Lake, which in 1861 required a long and toilsome march of two months and a half, was now passed over in *as many days* comfortably and pleasantly, in a luxurious Pullman car, with a telegraph line along the track to provide for all contingencies.

The spirit of Mormonism, however, was unchanged, and although the easy access to the outside world was already beginning to produce its effect, the Mormons formed practically a closed community, entirely separated in feeling and principle from the rest of mankind, looking with jealousy towards any increase of population, except from its own peculiar natural causes and its own emigrants from abroad.

Camp Douglas was established during the war by volunteers from California, against the earnest protest of the Mormon leaders,

who went so far even as to threaten active resistance. The troops were fortunately under the command of one who possessed the requisite firmness to disregard these threats, and General O'Connor firmly established himself in the position which at once became the rallying-point for disaffected Mormons and others who felt more secure under the shadow of the United States flag than within the Mormon community, where "apostates from the faith," as they were called, or obnoxious "Gentiles" were not safe from the knife of the secret assassin. A number of these murders had occurred within a comparatively recent period, and the Mormon leaders, especially Brigham Young, were openly charged with inciting or directly "counselling" them. Whether this charge was correct or not the fact remains that in no one single instance that I can recall was one of these murderers brought to justice and punished, so that unprejudiced minds will hold the community at large responsible for these crimes, even if proof be lacking to convict the leaders of directly or indirectly ordering their commission.

In this way the post of Camp Douglas became a sharp thorn in the side of the Mormon leaders. "Apostates" resorted to the post and were safe from Mormon persecution, and the dead of the "Gentiles" were deposited in their little cemetery, where a monument to the memory of Dr. Robinson, foully murdered when called from his house in the darkness of night on the pretence of ministering to a suffering patient, still calls for vengeance on his murderers. The position occupied by the post in 1869 is aptly described by Lieutenant-General Sheridan during a visit there in the summer of that year. He speaks of it as occupying the position of a consulate in a foreign country. It constituted the "city of refuge" of the country, within the limits of which all who flew from "the wrath of the church" were secure for the time being.

The post itself occupies a position some six or seven hundred feet above the city, and is situated on what is called a "bench," a nearly level shelf of land, several of which extend around the Valley of Salt Lake, plainly marking the former borders of the lake when the waters were at higher levels. It is directly in front of a cañon, out of which flows a fine stream of water, which, by means of trenches, is conducted through the post, and afterwards serves to irrigate the lands of the valley below. Behind it to the eastward rise the mountains of the Wahsatch range, which farther to the south tower up into prominent peaks, inclosing the Big and Little Cottonwoods and other cañons, at a later day to be filled with an enterprising mining population in search of the precious metals. In front the broad open Valley of Salt Lake extends like a vast map directly beneath the eye, and bordered by peaks which, during all but the warmer months, are capped with snow. At one point

in the northwest the beautiful lake stretched off to the *horizon*, where, with headlands upon each side, it presents the appearance of a sea-view from a land-locked harbor, making it easy to fancy oneself upon the seacoast instead of in the centre of a great continent. Through the centre of the valley runs the River *Jordan*, connecting Lake Utah with the Great Salt Lake, and the low ground near its mouth is broken up with various lakes and little patches of water, which as the sun sinks in the west become visible by the reflected light. But few more beautiful views can be found than is presented to a beholder at Camp Douglas when, late in the afternoon of a summer or fall day, he looks towards the setting sun as it dips behind the distant mountains. The reflected rays light up and bring to view various patches of water before unseen in the unbroken waste, which variegate the landscape; and, as the sun sinks behind an apparent ocean-horizon, they light up the whole scene with a peculiar roseate tint, which seems to be the effect of the salt in the water, as I have witnessed like effects at salt lakes in Texas.

The waters of Salt Lake form a saturated solution, in which it is almost impossible for a bather to sink. In it the human form floats without motion of hand or foot, like a cork, and although three considerable streams, the Jordan, the Weber, and Bear rivers, pour their fresh waters into it, the immense deposit of salt on the bottom keeps up the strength of the solution. Near the mouths of the streams the water, of course, varies from fresh to brackish, and fish are found in it; but in the body of the lake it was for some time supposed no living thing could exist. Examination, however, has disclosed the existence of a minute crablike insect, which is thrown upon the shore in vast numbers, and by decomposition produces a very decided odor. In the shallow water near the shore salt deposits of great thickness are found, and these, dug up and carried off in wagons, are, after purification, used for the usual purposes. The whole valley east of the lake and the River Jordan is fed by numerous streams of bright cold water, which, flowing down from the mountains, formerly meandered their way through a sage brush waste. By the use of these streams the industrious Mormons, by skilfully directed labor, have covered the bench lands and slopes with grain fields, fruit trees, and thriving villages. It is a curious sight to see a field of luxuriant wheat growing inside a rough fence, whilst outside is flourishing in the dry arid soil the sage brush in all its native wildness.

Most of these streams are stocked with an abundant supply of the most delicious brook trout, and these gave an incentive and a zest, which only an enthusiastic sportsman can appreciate, to many a ramble in the Rocky Mountains, during which I tramped over

ground since made valuable by the discovery of mineral deposits. I wandered amidst the most magnificent scenery, caught my trout, met the Mormon people, and varied the sport by angling with them on theological and philosophical questions. I never met with more kindly treatment as a general thing, and am free to confess that in all my intercourse with them they were as honest and conscientious in the expression of their opinions, so far as I could judge, as people of their class in society usually are. They were as ready, too, to snap at a theological bait thrown at them as the trout of their native streams at an attractive "*fly*."

A favorite place of resort was in Parley's Park, about twenty-five miles from Camp Douglas, where a house of entertainment was kept by a Mr. William Kimbal, a son of the Mormon prophet of that name, since dead. At my first visit we were cordially received, invited to fish in the stream which runs through his fields, and, having declined the proffered hospitalities of his house, were urged to pitch our tents in his grassy meadows. In the evening our camp-fire furnished a favorable location for a council ground, and around it we chatted with Mr. Kimbal, first about the fishing, then about the country, and gradually drifting into Mormonism. I found him very intelligent and frank, and his manner prompted me to ask him a plain question. I found that, whilst a pronounced Mormon, he professed as much pride in being a citizen of the United States as any one. I, therefore, said: "Mr. Kimbal, you profess to be a loyal citizen of the United States, do you not?"

"Certainly, I do."

"How then do you reconcile your position with the fact that you are living in open violation of the United States laws?" The question seemed to dumfound him for a moment. He looked his astonishment, and I continued:

"Are you not a practical Mormon and a polygamist?"

"Yes," he said, "I am; but I have *never married since the passage of the anti-polygamy law*, and am not violating the law, since by the Constitution Congress cannot enact any *ex-post facto* laws!"

This was a novel view of the subject, and although the doctrine was probably unsound it clearly demonstrated the fact that the law had set at least a portion of the Mormons to *thinking* and arguing out their position under the law. Mr. Kimbal was evidently earnest and conscientious, and not disposed to permit the Mormon priesthood to lead him into any *further* violations of the law. But his was only a single instance. Others did not exhibit such scruples, and still continued to openly violate the law at the dictation of Brigham Young and his "counsellors."

Such "counselling," as it was called, was generally accepted by the "saints" with the fullest faith in Brigham Young's authority

as a messenger from the Almighty. The idea was impressed upon his followers that the woman gains her exaltation in the next world through the man, and although I am not sufficiently well versed in the doctrine to say whether or not they went to the extreme of holding that all salvation was denied to spinsters, yet this much is certain, it was strongly impressed upon all that the wife shared in the "glory" of the husband, and that the exaltation of the latter, his seat and influence in the heavenly realms, depended upon the number of his seed—that is, upon the number and, it is presumed, the quality of his children. It is a fruitless speculation now to argue how it was possible for any man in this advanced age of civilization to impress upon his followers a doctrine so closely bordering upon the Mohammedan, regarding a subject upon which he could by no possibility *know anything*. The *fact* remains, and is a very strong proof of Brigham Young's influence with a people over whom, until quite recently, his simple word had the effect of law. It is a tribute to his intellect, which even his worst enemies cannot deny, that, whilst really ruling with despotic powers, he has succeeded in making his followers believe that they rule themselves. The spectacle presented to an outsider of a vast Mormon assemblage voting by raised hands on one of Brigham Young's propositions, "cut and dried" beforehand, is sufficiently amusing.

It may not be out of place, however, to make some comments as to how Brigham Young gained such an influence. One of the lower spurs of the Wahsatch range near his residence in Salt Lake is pointed out to strangers as the place where the Prophet was formerly in the habit of "going up to the Mount to commune with the Lord and pray," and, if only a part of what is told of him be true, it may account in a measure for his influence over a population in which the most marked characteristic is extreme ignorance, whilst it demonstrates that as a close observer of nature's workings he has few superiors. It is related that the first season after the advent of the Mormons into Salt Lake Valley the people were made desperate at seeing their growing crops ruthlessly destroyed by vast herds of black crickets. In the midst of "the murmuring of the people" against "the chastening of the Lord," and the prospect of starvation, Brigham Young counselled patience and reliance upon the Lord, who would not permit his "chosen people" to be destroyed, and *predicted* that in a few days vast swarms of birds would appear to destroy the pests of the grain-fields. And sure enough, so runs the legend, in a short time gulls, similar to the common sea-gull, numbers of which can be seen about the Lake, appeared in vast flocks and commenced their work on the crickets. It is related that this bird will gorge itself with the crickets, then

*dis*gorge and go at its work again. Now whether this story is strictly true or not, it will serve to show the character of Brigham Young's influence over his people, and no one can fail to remark the Mosaic type of the legend. It reminds us, too, of the method by which the Seminole "medicine-man" got rid of his enemies. He made up little puppets and named them after certain parties whose influence in the tribe was becoming obnoxious to him. These he set up in "council" and shot at them with arrows. If the puppet was hit he predicted the early death of the individual represented, and if he did not hit the first time he took another shot! The obnoxious party was very sure soon after to die a sudden death, and the "medicine-man" was "a true prophet." Unless Brigham Young is a very much slandered man, he copied Sam Jones as well as Moses, depending in both cases for the impression made by the fulfilment of his prophecies on that element in human nature which so readily, in deluded people, assigns supernatural causes where natural ones can easily be discovered, either by close observation or the use of such material as the Mormon Prophet had at hand in his "Avenging Angels" or "Band of Danites."

Another favorite fishing resort was Cottonwood Cañon, where on our first visit we made the acquaintance of a Mr. B., who kept the tollgate over the Mormon road built up the cañon to a lake situated almost at the very top of the mountains, both stream and lake furnishing abundant sport. During a subsequent visit a rainstorm drove us for shelter into Mr. B.'s cabin, where we were hospitably entertained by his cheerful little wife, who never seemed to be without a pleasant word or song upon her lips. I had with me two favorite dogs, a setter and a pointer, neither of which would ever suffer the other to be caressed without poking his own nose under the hand to get his share. Mrs. B. at once won our good wishes by insisting the dogs should come in too, declared she was fond of dogs, and kindly patted Don on the head. Instantly Jackey's nose was pushed forward for recognition, and Mrs. B. broke into a ringing laugh, with the exclamation, "There's jealousy for you!" The quick recognition of the feeling led easily to the subject of polygamy, and I was induced to remark that doubtless she was Mr. B.'s *only* wife? a question which in any other portion of the civilized globe would have been regarded as the grossest of insults. "Indeed I am," she replied, "and likely to be the only one." B. and herself, she said, were of one mind upon that subject; she did not think he would ever care to have another wife, and she was very sure she would never desire it. But, oh, inconsistency of human nature! The moment I expressed strong opposition to the doctrine of polygamy she ruffled up, like a hen whose chicken

is attacked, and commenced to defend it, telling us how her father's *second* wife, when he went "on a mission," took charge of, fed, and clothed the children of his first wife (her mother) and many other things to show us (the unbelieving Gentiles) how advantageous it was sometimes for a man to have several wives. The "*church doctrine*" must be upheld though every noble prompting of the gentle heart rose up in arms against it, and the possibility of a personal application being thrust out of sight. B. was a small-sized man, and his wife ended the talk with the quaint remark that "what little there was of him she wanted herself," which was greeted with a hearty laugh of approbation, and we always renewed our acquaintance with Mrs. B. on our fishing trips with pleasure.

I have remarked that one of the characteristics of the Mormon population as a body is their extreme ignorance. This feature in the Mormon people has been taken advantage of by their leaders, many of whom are very far from being ignorant. They have skilfully directed such education as is given in the Territory to their own ends, and by a system of clerical instruction they are leading the minds of the rising generation, as they lead their irrigating ditches, to fructify only such seed as they themselves have planted. This is done by a system of schools, not only under charge of the leaders of "the church," but supplied with textbooks *prepared* and *printed* in the Territory, and it is doubtful if the same amount of ignorance can be found over the same extent of country in any civilized region of the world.

Once, whilst on a fishing excursion in the Valley of the Timpañogos, a fine large stream, which empties into Lake Utah from the eastward, and on the bank of which is situated Heber City, quite a large flourishing town, my camp was visited by several boys, who, boy like, were ready to give us all the information we wanted in regard to the deepest and best trout-holes in the stream. We soon got into free conversation with them, and one of them, a boy of twelve or fourteen years of age, was asked if he knew who was President of the United States. His stolid look of ignorance showed that he was entirely "at sea," and I asked him if he knew "who General Grant was?" He had heard me addressed as "General," and replied, "No; not unless *you* are him!" When asked if he knew who governed the country he lived in, he frankly confessed he did not "unless it was Brother Brigham!" and when told that Brigham Young was not even a subordinate official, he received the information with a smile of incredulity, which said, as plainly as words could say it, that *he* knew better than that, and that we were a party of "ungodly Gentiles," trying to lead him astray. Is it any wonder that in a community so governed, where all instruction is given by

"the church," that all true education is at fault, and that ignorance should prevail.

Of course such a state of things cannot exist forever, and the march of civilization, as typified by railroads, telegraphs, a free press, and the influx of an outside population, will in time effect a change. Already have these begun to have their effect, but the human mind, like water, will not run up hill if left to itself. It has to be *pumped* up by machinery. That pumping process is now going forward in Utah.

Until the advent of the railroad into the Territory the Mormon people was a close corporation, in which men held property and even life itself at the mercy of the authorities of "the church." This is a fact notoriously denied by the leaders of "the church," but known to be true by every one who has had opportunity to make observations. Innumerable cases of cold-blooded murders of "Gentiles" obnoxious to "the church" are known to have occurred, and in not one single instance has the perpetrator been brought to punishment so far as I can recall.

The wholesale butchery, nineteen years ago, of the men, women, and children belonging to an emigrant train, so far from resulting in bringing to justice the perpetrators of it, was persistently attributed by the newspapers and leaders in "the church" to Indians, and for long years every obstacle was thrown in the way of any attempt to investigate the matter. Military and civil officers of the United States visited the scene of the massacre at Mountain Meadows soon after the occurrence, and obtained evidence which settled the question beyond a doubt that Mormons and Mormon leaders were the pepetrators of the foul outrage; and if the question as to whether or not the act was "counselled" by the highest authorities of "the church" is still an open one not yet settled by positive proof, their guilty knowledge is beyond dispute, and the damaging fact remains that for nineteen years not only has no attempt been made by the Mormon authorities to bring to justice the perpetrators of the foulest outrage ever committed in a country professing to be civilized, but every effort has been put forth to shield the guilty, and every obstacle thrown in the way of a judicial investigation. These efforts have been successful for nineteen long years, during which the blood of the innocent victims has been calling for vengeance in vain from one of the far-off recesses of the Rocky Mountains. But last year the principal leader of the band of murderers, a bishop in "the church," was brought before a jury of his *peers*, and—convicted? No, for a portion at least of his "peers" were Mormons like himself, and the jury declined to convict, as Mormon juries uniformly decline to convict, at the nod of "the church," which governs everything in this world and the next. But this

year another trial takes place, and as I write one of those pumping machines, the telegraph, which is forcing the Mormon mind to a higher level, flashes all over the land the intelligence that John D. Lee, the active leader of that murderous band nineteen years ago, has been convicted of the crime and sentenced to death, and, strange freak of all, a Mormon paper now speaks of the condemned criminal as the "arch fiend." Is this an evidence of a returning sense of justice and virtue, or a result of some occult trick in the policy of the head of "the church?" Time and further developments resulting from other trials to take place only can show. Inasmuch as so sudden a change to justice and virtue in the course of a single year is not probable, it is more than suspected that the conviction of Lee is due to church "counselling." This view of the case naturally brings us to the question as to how long a system like that of the Mormons can exist after the active mind which governs the whole is removed. If a ship at sea is entirely dependent upon a single man to guide her course, the removal of that one insures her destruction when tempests assail her. In despotisms men are governed *too much*. As they are not permitted to act except at the nod and beck of some particular person, all individuality is lost, and men cease even to think for themselves. When, therefore, the one person disappears, the many suffer and are literally "at sea" without a rudder when the storm comes, which it sooner or later does to all human institutions. A community governed by free institutions is comparatively free from such dangers, and no *one man* is an absolute necessity. In that case the community governs itself. Whether well or illy governed rests with itself, and if ordinary freedom and intelligence prevail the chances are that it will be well governed, and on such sound principles that the presence or absence of any particular individual will be of little account, however valuable for the time being, and the system of government will continue from one generation to the next like a well-regulated, smoothly-working machine.

All who have had an opportunity of observing the workings of government in Utah know that the Mormon community is not such a one as I have described. It is undeniable that the governing principle has resided until very recently in one man, and it is equally undeniable that in many things Brigham Young has governed well. His enemies say his government has been and is based entirely upon selfish principles. However this may be, the general results in many respects have been beneficial. The population as a class is industrious and thrifty, and by its labor has converted an immense extent of barren territory into blooming and productive fields, and this has been done frequently under the most disadvantageous and discouraging circumstances. The people too

are virtuous, as *they understand virtue*, and are generally honest, except when led astray by their leaders. To hear the "rank and file," taking their cue from their leaders, gravely asserting the superior virtue of the Mormon population over all the rest of mankind, would be amusing were it not so serious a matter, and had those who make the claim any experience whatever which would enable them to judge of what the remainder of the world regard as virtue. The virtues impressed upon the Mormon people by Brigham Young's overweening influence are of a peculiar nature, and in some respects not such as meet with indorsement from civilized mankind. That he has so impressed his peculiar ideas upon his people is an unquestionable proof, not only of his vast influence, but demonstrates that in point of intellect he is far above the average.

Since the death of Brigham Young, which occurred since this paper was written, no other man has since been "raised up," in Mormon phraseology, to fill his place, and it is more than doubtful if the Mormon exists who can *fill* it. For some time previous to his death, a report was current, which was probably well founded, that he was making strenuous efforts to so arrange matters in "the church" as to insure his mantle being bequeathed to one of his sons. But death's summons came suddenly, and before matters could be so arranged; and the church is now, I believe, governed by "The Council of Twelve," no one of whom has yet demonstrated that he possesses the intellect, nerve, tact, and unscrupulous character of the man who will go down in history as the great leader of the Mormon Church, Brigham Young.

THE INTERNAL CONDITION OF RUSSIA.

THE present internal condition of Russia is attracting equal if not even greater interest than her external policy in the recent past excited. Reports from various sources, both numerous and trustworthy, disclose a state of things truly appalling, and one which takes not a few in this country, if not in Europe, outside of Russia, entirely by surprise. The causes of this surprise in the United States are to be found to a great extent in self-interest and in the influence of a venal press in systematically glossing over, if not entirely suppressing, facts which, if duly considered, would at least have moderated, if not dispelled, the extravagantly favorable opinion commonly entertained by the American public respecting the policy of the Russian Government, and the actual degree of progress in education and industrial pursuits of the Russian people. To this must be added the fact, which cannot be concealed, humiliating as it may be to acknowledge it, that the people of the United States are idolatrous worshippers of material power. With them success is a sure guarantee of popular approval, no matter what be the means by which that success is attained. The glamour of strength and power and inexhaustible resources, which were generally attributed to the Russian Government, blinded the eyes and deluded the judgment of the great majority of the people of the United States in regard to the real condition of Russia. Then there was another reason for prevailing delusions in regard to that country, which applies to Europe as well as to this country, though perhaps in less degree. We refer to the fact that it has been customary to include Russia in the family of civilized, enlightened nations. It is no wonder, therefore, that the public mind is startled by recent disclosures which seem to throw us back, when we consider the inward significance of the facts lately made public, into the ages of Asiatic despotism.

Until very recently the idea of political stability has been associated with Russia, and apparently not without good reasons. When the French Revolution burst forth a hundred years ago, the spirit that animated it overleaped the boundaries of France, and in the short space of fifty years, from 1789 to 1849, it caused almost every throne in Europe to tremble and totter. In the midst of the general apprehension and dismay Russia alone apparently remained unaffected by the disturbing causes. The Czar stood forth before us as the sole representative of stability. His dominions seemingly were beyond reach of the revolutionary cyclone which swept over all the rest of Europe. His person alone seemed invested with the unassailable, imperturbable majesty which is the traditional

characteristic of sovereignty. Whatever changes or convulsions disturbed or threatened the peace of other countries, Russia remained unchanged, undisturbed, quiet.

Nor is this all. The "Emperor of all the Russias" played with success the *rôle* of restorer of peace and order by aiding in pacifying or subduing popular uprisings in other countries. An instance directly in point is the assistance he rendered Austria in suppressing the rebellion of her Hungarian subjects. It was, therefore, quite natural that Russia, of all European powers, came to be considered as the *one* country above all danger of infection from revolutionary ideas. The events following 1848 did not weaken that prestige. The Crimean War, ended by the Treaty of Paris, had practically no other effect than to convince the governments of Europe that the Slav power of the North was one of gigantic dimensions; one whose ambitious schemes in the East could be neutralized only by a concerted action of Middle Europe; one, finally, which, at a future day, might endanger the balance of power by a Northern dictatorship. Then, again, many other considerations confirmed the belief that Russia had entered with a will upon what she conceived to be her mission; and that progress and civilization had acquired their full modern significance even in the realm of the Czar. Of these we enumerate the abolition of serfdom throughout the vast dominion of the Czar, the construction of a network of railroads, the expansion of commerce and trade, the conquest of Khokand, and the expeditions to Khiva. The campaigns of 1859, 1864, 1866, and the Franco-German War left Russia free to devote her undivided energies to the development of her immense resources. Thus she became *per fas vel nefas* the "Colossus of the North." No wonder, therefore, that when the outbreak of hostilities between Servia and the Porte signalized a new phase of the Eastern question, Europe concerned itself chiefly about the attitude which Russia would take.

It is not necessary to dwell here upon the series of events which began with the review of troops at Kischeneff, when the Czar bade them cross the Pruth, and ended, south of the Balkans, with the appearance of the Russian eagles before the walls of Constantinople. In spite of Osman Pasha's heroic defence of Plevna; in spite of the stubborn resistance offered in the Shipka Pass, Russia entered upon a career of success, victory following victory, until the Ottoman power lay crushed and exhausted at the mercy of the Czar, in Europe as well as in Asia. The Treaty of San Stefano, dropping the humanitarian pretext put forth at the beginning of the campaign, was an emphatic declaration in the face of Europe that Russia meant to supersede the rule of the Turks in Europe, and intended henceforth to act as "apostle of civilization" in the

Levant. Then came the memorable Congress at Berlin. The demands of Russia, it is true, were considerably curtailed by the diplomates assembled in the Palais Radzivill; but to the peace of Berlin has been applied what was said of the peace of Amiens, namely, that it was a treaty "about which every one was glad, but nobody proud." Despite large concessions—concessions that were compulsory—Russia nevertheless gained her end. For, Russian influence in the East is more potent to-day than it ever was before, and though the nominal dependency of the Sultan, namely, the suzerain principality of Bulgaria, has been made to embrace only the country north of the Balkan range of mountains, in direct opposition to Russian wishes, Bulgaria under Prince Battenburg, the grandnephew of the Czar, is *de facto* a Russian province, and the Southern frontier of Russia, though not reaching, as Russia at first demanded, to the Ægean Sea, is virtually advanced to the Balkan Mountains. It is true, therefore, that the fruits of victories won by Russian arms in the field of battle were somewhat lessened by defeats in diplomacy. But often a diplomatic defeat has the effect of a victory, and *vice versa;* and this is the case as regards Russia's position after the labors of the Congress at Berlin. The instrument there drawn up by the representatives of the great powers of Europe has neither checked Russian ascendency in the East, nor has it prevented the Cabinet of St. Petersburg from converting the Porte from an enemy into an ally.

Allowing their due force to these considerations it would be entirely incorrect, it seems to us, to believe what has been asserted, namely, that the present discontent in Russia springs from the anger of the nation at finding that the immense sacrifices, made necessary by the late war, have brought no advantage to the empire. Nor can we share the opinion of those who ascribe the revolutionary outbursts in Russia solely to the mischievous workings of the Nihilists. Both views, the one which makes the war, and the other which makes the Nihilists, responsible for the disorder, are superficial. Both are dangerous illusions, and have resulted, we think, from a certain reluctance to resign long-held and apparently correct, but in reality incorrect, opinions respecting Russia. If we recall to mind that the disturbances began to show themselves in force long before the war was concluded, we will be forced to acknowledge that they cannot spring from dissatisfaction with the *result* of the war. The first view has, therefore, no actual basis of fact.

As to the second, it is not a handful of reckless miscreants which the government at St. Petersburg has to deal with, and endeavors to strike down. Were this the case, the social struggle in Russia would be divested of any deep meaning, and might be regarded as

simply a transitory disturbance. For, then, indeed, we might hold that "the force which a settled government can bring to bear upon Communists, Socialists, Nihilists, or by whatever names the conspirators against the social order are to be described, will succeed in repressing the ebulition." But, as a matter of fact, the social discontent is spread through all classes of the population and is found in every rank of society; and for this reason it seems to us impossible to regard the movement in Russia as only a Nihilistic rebellion.

The war, so Russians argued before its outbreak, might free the country from an arrogant and corrupt despotism; the war might precipitate the downfall of a system of government which had driven the nation to the brink of despair, because, in war, the weakness and the corruption of this system would probably become glaringly visible. Thus, we see, the war was partly the work, as it was also the main hope, of the revolutionists of 1877. Its immediate effect, in our judgment, has simply been to bring the already half-ripe elements of universal dissatisfaction to an early maturity.

Looked at in this light the exceptional condition in Russia acquires a different and a much graver meaning. The French revolution produced "reigns of terror," as we all know; and "reigns of terror" have in preceding ages, time and again, appeared sporadically. But of all those that we find recorded in history, there is none comparable with *that* reign of terror from which the realm of the Czar is now trembling. And, since the tendency to underrate the seriousness of the complications in Russia is both widespread and deeprooted, it is, we hope, not amiss to cite a few facts, the consideration of which will dispel erroneous preconceptions.

Shortly after the appointment of General Gourko as military governor of the "government (district) of St. Petersburg," a decree was issued which placed the army under the surveillance of the police. Inasmuch as this measure by its very nature would necessarily tend to create indignation in the ranks of the army, its expediency may be questioned. The General himself, however, declares it a necessity, "because the army," he says, "is infested with discontent." The fact which directly led to it may serve as a case in point. General Gourko one day found a paper on his writing-desk, notifying him that the "Secret National Government" had passed sentence of death upon him. It so happened that only officers of the general staff and of the imperial guard had entered his house on that day, so that suspicion, of course, fastened upon them. The police, intrusted with the search of residences and persons, found, at last, compromising documents on one of the officers, and the result of this discovery was the publication of the decree just mentioned. So much as regards the army.

As to the number and social composition of the revolutionists we need only turn to official statements in the Russian press. Siberia, they say, is threatened with over-population. The colony of Semilashinsk received 3166 exiles within the months of January and February, 1879. Nine thousand arrested persons are on the road via Moscow to Siberia. No less than 58,000 have been transported there during the last three years.

The eleven prisons for the reception of convicts, namely, Irkoutsk, Tobolsk, Vilna, Perm, Pekow, Simbirsk, Iletskaja, Fastchita, Noroborisso, and Kharkoff, are so overcrowded that a regular service of deportation between Odessa and the island Saghalien has been established.

In Kieff ten prisoners were undergoing trial by court-martial in the early part of the month of April. Six of that number were females and only four males. Three of the latter were noblemen; and of the former, one was a lady of title and one the daughter of a privy councillor. Here is a fair specimen of the proportions in which sex and rank are mixed up among the conspirators, and it would be easy to multiply the instances. Suffice it to state, however, that the numbers as well as the rank of the revolutionists warrant the conclusion that Nihilism, pure and simple, could not have spread to such an extent as to produce the results before us. Additional to other reasons there is the fact that the Russian Government has certainly not been backward in resorting at once to measures of a sweeping character, and of the utmost severity against the Nihilists. Yet the situation is becoming graver and graver. From well-informed sources it appears that the revolutionists have adopted a new policy against the stern attitude of the government. This policy, we learn, consists chiefly in spreading terror and confusion in the large cities, and keeping the police incessantly on the "*qui-vive*." Herewith tallies the report of a proposed attack on the Winter Palace. It was a hoax, but so skilfully devised that the Grand Duke Nicholas remained for eight days with his suite in the building occupied by the general staff, and six or seven regiments were kept in readiness in their barracks, expecting an outbreak every moment. On another occasion, the "Third Section" received information that the blowing up of the gasometers was contemplated during the night, which proved another false alarm. Various corroborative accounts confirm, however, the belief that the revolutionists intended in all earnest to enact a "St. Bartholomew's night" in the capital on the 3d (15th) of June. The plan was frustrated by a timely discovery of it by the police, in consequence of which the authorities made most elaborate precautionary preparations. There seems to be no room to doubt but that these alone prevented the outbreak.

Now, all these facts have a meaning, and it is that the grievances of Russian society are not imaginary but real, grim, calamitous facts. Complaint is made that there is not one single section of the Russian world which does not revolt at the long-prevailing system of administrative corruption and grinding tyranny. The peasant class, it is maintained, suffers more than ever before. They are mercilessly pressed for arrears of taxes; they have been robbed of the lands which, as serfs, they cultivated for themselves under their former masters; they are plundered by those who have the management of their affairs; they are literally reduced to a state of wretchedness for which they find consolation only in drink.

The provincial police exercises more than ever an arbitrary and cruel power, and the peasantry after being beggared are thrown as a helpless proletariat on the world. They are forced in great numbers by compulsory drafts into the army, to be slaughtered on battle-fields by the conspicuous inability of generals. In place of free institutions, which Russian society was led to expect at the beginning of the present reign, there is nothing but administrative tyranny and outrageous injustice. All individual rights and the rights of humanity are denied, and trampled upon with pitiless cruelty. The courts of justice are a mockery, the press is subservient to an odious government. Thousands have been imprisoned; the country has been drained of its money and of its resources. To this extreme of misery, malcontents declare, Russia has been brought during the present reign.

We are very far from giving implicit credence to all these statements. There is, doubtless, some exaggeration; but though exaggerated these utterances contain many grains of truth, and, therefore, we cannot afford to either disregard or dismiss them. If we readily concede that the stringency of the measures adopted by the Russian Government for the maintenance of order were justified, as is alleged, by the emergency, we ought to be no less ready to concede that the condition of the population which gave rise to this emergency must have been most deplorable. No doubt the arbitrary rule of the present *régime militaire* of governors, invested with absolute power and responsible only to the Emperor, may convert many a peaceful subject of the crown into a secret foe by inflicting undeserved punishment upon the innocent. But we cannot give assent to a mode of reasoning which moves in a circle and explains the existence of seriously disturbed internal relations by the severity of certain measures of the Government, and then justifies this severity by pointing to those disturbed relations. Had not all classes of Russian society been suffering from arbitrary and irresponsible rule for generations; had they not borne a yoke heavier than that of slavery; had they not been driven to

despair, one and all; had not this been the case—then, the efforts of all classes towards shaking off the old and securing a new and more equitable state of things, would be as unaccountable as the phenomenon that they show no discrimination in the selection of the means by which they hope to break their galling chains, a phenomenon peculiar to those only who are mad with despair. Without intense, extreme exasperation, the Russian world would not rush blindfold, as it were, into the arms of Nihilism.

And, indeed, we cannot realize the calamitous reign of terror as it unfortunately exists to-day in Russia, to its full extent, nor can we understand the nature of the social upheaval in that country, still less can we weigh the strength of the contending forces, if we do not extend our inquiry into the past. For the accumulation of an enormous autocratic power by the Czars on one side, and the successive and progressive deterioration of the condition of their subjects on the other, have gone on for many ages hand-in-hand. Russia entered the family of civilized nations at a late date. Before the time of Peter the Great the culture and civilization of Middle Europe had not reached the Slav tribes of the North. The history of the Ruriks, who died out in 1589, bears no resemblance to the history of those illustrious houses who reigned as their contemporaries. And when after a fifteen years' struggle Michael Romanow united, at last, the more important tribes under one sceptre, the realm then only entered on the period of consolidation. From 1613 to 1700 under the Romanoffs the nationality of Great Russia asserted simply its supremacy over the other Russian and Slavic tribes by conquest and subjugation, that is to say, always by force. During that whole period no perceptible advance was made towards civilization. The acceptance of Christianity (Greek-rite) had offered no difficulty to the deepseated religious feeling of the nation. The new era dawns for Russia with Peter. Rude, bold, and fearless, gifted with keen perception and unswerving tenacity of purpose, he proposed to make Russia's weight felt in the councils of Europe; he proposed to add her to the "civilized" nations. The natural gradual development of the race in art, science, and letters had then hardly begun. Peter opened by force avenues for the ingress of civilizing influences; and, eminently successful as he was, he left his country in a wonderful state of progression. Only a ruler of the giant energy of Peter could have accomplished what he did. He bestowed signal benefits upon the semi-barbarous nation; but he also prepared the way for a future catastrophe by inaugurating absolutism. The consolidation of the Empire was a peremptory requisite to the success of his plans. But he went beyond what was necessary. He not only made Russia a power centring in the person, in the

will of the Czar, but he abolished the one power which he found to exist beside his own; namely, the power of the Church. Up to the beginning of the eighteenth century the Metropolitan of Moscow was the acknowledged head of the hierarchy of the Greek Church in Russia, and was practically independent of the Patriarch at Constantinople. The bishops, monks, and ruling elders, controlled by the Metropolitan at Moscow, exercised great and undisputed influence over the minds and actions of the people. Peter ridiculed the pomp of the clergy, reduced their influence, and nominated and confirmed himself as the Patriarch of all Christians within his dominions. For the Greek Church he substituted the Russian Church, a creation of his own. By moulding the spiritual power into abject subserviency to the temporal power, he widened the breach between the Church of the East and the Church of the West. Up to his time the dividing line between the religious creed professed by the Russians and that of the Latin Church had been the *filioque* in the creed. He destroyed all prospect of a union. He set himself up as both high priest and king, and became the first absolute ruler of the civil as well as of the religious concerns of all his subjects.

Even now the spiritual affairs of the realm are regulated by a standing council of bishops appointed by the Czar, and presided over generally by one of his aide-de-camps in uniform. The Council has virtually nothing else to do but to carry out the instructions which it pleases the Emperor to deliver to its presiding officer, and which he in turn imparts to the Council. Owing to this state of affairs, the clergy in Russia have lost by degrees the dignity which they once possessed; learning has almost entirely disappeared from among them, and so, too, religion has been degraded and reduced to an empty observance of rites and ceremonials. The two distinct classes into which the Russian clergy is divided, namely, the "white" and the "black" clergy, are at daggers' point. The parish-priest, who must be married, is compelled to submit to the dictates of the unmarried—the bishops and monks. According to the regulations of the Russian Church no one who is married can be ordained priest, so that the ecclesiastical students in the seminaries are married before orders are conferred upon them. The practice has obtained that the bishops select wives for these seminarists. For reasons of expediency the bishop's choice falls generally either upon the widow or the daughter of a deceased parish-priest; without consulting the wishes or inclinations of either of the parties to be married. In this arbitrary way the seminarist is provided with a scanty living, to which an undesired spouse and dependent relations are mostly annexed, and he submits to it with that stolid resignation which forms a characteristic feature

of the whole nation. The moral effect of this odious system may be easily imagined. To this must be added that the education given at the seminaries is of a most superficial character, hardly deserving the name education, and that the popes (parish-priests) are in most cases constrained to use the sacred office of minister of God as a means of extortion for obtaining their own and their families' support. Not a few exhibit publicly the most disgraceful examples of debauchery and drunkenness. Nor is this surprising if we recall to our minds the deeds of wanton cruelty and gross sensuality which the spiritual heads of the Russian Church have committed in the course of time, deeds that outrage the first principles of Christianity. Respect for virtue and honor have become extinct alike in clergy and laity, and in their stead vice and drunkenness seem to be at a premium.

Peter, however, did not foresee these disastrous consequences. What he aimed at was to make Russia a great nation with one language, one religion, and one will, and that will the Czar's will. His one aim was the attainment of earthly omnipotence. And the realization of this ideal has been the foremost thought and the highest ambition of his successors. Recognizing the importance of religious unity, he unscrupulously manufactured it, or a mechanical semblance of it, and bequeathed it to the Czars who succeeded him. It is a fact of comparatively recent occurrence that Nicholas has *forced* numbers of the adherents of the Orthodox Greek rite into the Russian Church.

The reign next in importance to Peter's as regards effects of a lasting character on Russia, is that of Catharine II. Her rule exemplifies conspicuously the extraordinary means possessed by the head of an absolute government for producing good or evil. As a genuine Czarina she used the imperial power to augment the importance of the crown and to draw tighter still the reins of irresponsible and arbitrary absolutism upon a nation harnessed to the state chariot. To the waning splendor of the old Russian nobility she gave a death-blow. Though deprived already under Peter of many privileges, the aristocracy up to Catharine's time had been allowed to act as an advisory body to the crown on public affairs. This interposition between sovereign and people Catharine abolished, and destroyed the political functions and power of Russian noblemen forever. This was done, seemingly, with the consent of the nation. The power of publishing ukases had existed before, it is true; but only after the Council of Moscow did a ukase become superior to all precedents, the one and the sole law of the land, superseding even all previous ukases. The last vestige of a position which entitled them to consideration, at least, was thereby withdrawn from the princely families of ancient

date. Up to the time of the French Revolution Catharine had fostered progress and civilization. But the moment that hydra showed itself in France, she changed entirely. French science and French literature were banished from her court, and the western frontier was carefully guarded, not only against the inroads of revolution, but likewise against the advance of culture and refinement. From that time on she baffled every project which tended to expand the intellectual or æsthetic horizon of Russian society; and in order to carry out her policy with success, she developed further the system of espionage which she found already in vogue. Nor did she fail in this, for she established an espionage as horrible and as degrading in character as it was complete in detail. It extended throughout the land, and reached every individual of every condition in every part of the world. This system has been one of the most fruitful sources of the frightful corruption which pervades every department of public service, and which the Czars have tried in vain to avert. The venality and corruption of Turkish officials have become proverbial. The venality and corruption among Russian office-holders, though less known, are greater in reality, and not only rival but outstrip the worst type of Pasha maladministration. Catharine's reign, however, derives its paramount importance, not from the fact that under her the sympathy of the nobility was alienated from the throne, nor from the fact that she checked the inflowing tide of progress by placing unlimited power in the hands of the secret police. Both measures were certainly bound to engender contempt, if not hatred, for a government whose strength lay in the success with which it oppressed its subjects. Catharine's reign is so important because she ingrafted the nation with an ulcer, which has poisoned its very life-blood and turned her epithet of "mother of the country" into a biting sarcasm.

The domestic life of the Russians of an earlier period was connected with such ideas of female chastity as are found to exist with more or less vigor among all barbarians. Before Catharine's day adultery was considered a most heinous crime, and in spite of the open depravity of Anna and Elizabeth, and of a rather lax morality among the higher classes, it continued to be punished by burying the guilty one alive up to the waist. Catharine changed the punishment for adultery into that of an ordinary crime. Not satisfied with herself setting an example of dishonor to her sex, she actually encouraged universal profligacy by opening and endowing "hospitals" for the offspring of adulterous mothers.

The parentless children who owed their existence to a free sway of the lowest of all animal passions have only to be deposited at a certain place in these institutions to gain admittance and be reared

at the expense of the state. It is optional with the mother to leave her name or the name she wishes the child to bear. At the hospital founded by Catharine in Moscow from six to eight hundred wet-nurses attend to the wants of the poor infants. Undeniably there is a philanthropic, nay, an almost touching side presented by thus caring for the guiltless offspring of guilt. But what affects the morality of the people is not the secondary, the philanthropic, but the primary element, namely, the ease of getting rid of the fruits of immorality. The close interdependence of religion and morality need not be dwelt upon here. On account of this, however, Peter had already been the forerunner of Catharine, for it was he, as we have observed, who made religion a ludicrous instrument in the hands of a despotic ruler. He destroyed the basis of morality and religion; his bad work was principally of a negative character. Catharine broached the positive side of the process of demoralizing the people.

Proceeding from these two sovereigns to the Czars of later date, the same conception of absolute power is found to have uniformly prevailed. Since the time of the French Revolution it seems to have been the firm determination of all the rulers of Russia not to permit any new idea or any new principle evolved by the progress of civilization to enter their realm. They rather endeavored to keep the Russians in ignorance that they had certain inalienable natural rights as human beings; they were anxious that the population should not discover that in other countries people of their own condition enjoyed certain privileges. To this system is traceable the order which forbade noblemen to reside abroad, and the censorship which is in full vigor to-day. The latter, indeed, is a measure which we cannot pass over without some cursory remarks.

There are nine commissioners or censors in Russia, and any publication not licensed by one of them is prohibited literature. All foreign books and papers with a grain of liberal opinion in them are tabooed; nor are native publications allowed to circulate, unless they have been approved or "corrected" by the censors. The natural consequence of this restriction is that all unlicensed books from abroad are not only eagerly sought after and read, but meditated upon as if their contents were Gospel truths. Nor is it, under these circumstances, surprising to learn that Russians of real culture have formed secret clubs for the purpose of making arrangements with booksellers for the purchase of unlicensed books, for only by this means can they keep abreast with the discoveries of the age. Nor is this all the mischief resulting from the attempt to check the invasion of foreign literature. The consequences are much more serious. In the course of time the secret clubs entered into a union among themselves, and now they have branches all

over the country. It is easy to understand how, in times like those of to-day in Russia, this network of societies may be changed into a most powerful political or revolutionary organization. Besides, the censorship debased the standard of native literature and lent a pernicious tone to the Russian publications abroad. Under the enjoyment of greater freedom of circulation of home and foreign literature the undue appetite for "forbidden fruits," common to perverse human nature, would not have produced results which it is impossible to deny are for Russia's government a source of danger.

One Nihilistic periodical is now published in London, entitled *Wpered* (*Forward*), and others are published in Geneva, Berne, and Amsterdam. These journals, printed expressly for contraband importation, certainly are, for the most part, abominable sheets. They cross the frontier in tin boxes, as we learn, and evade the vigilance of the custom-house officials, as shipments of sardines, canned fruits, preserved meat, condensed milk, and the like. It is sadly amusing to notice the ingenuity with which innocent enough looking tin boxes have been hit upon as the only safe vehicles of journalism.

We have said enough, we trust, to throw light upon the real condition of the Russia of to-day. The time has arrived, in our opinion, when in spite of unsparing despotism the dead level of contented ignorance can be maintained no longer. The whole population evinces a firm determination not to acquiesce any longer in a system which recognizes no rights at all, but which places everything, both in the spiritual and in the temporal order, at the mercy of an irresponsible despot. Whatever advance Russia has made in the path of education and intellectual culture during the last half century, has been essentially irreligious. There is no one to impart instruction in genuine religion; there is no one to make head against the swelling tide of immorality. There is no one to check the spread of skepticism; there is no one to heal the universal chronic disease of immorality.

The Russian empire of to-day is a mass of men sufficiently well instructed to be aware that they are excluded from a measure of political freedom which is enjoyed everywhere else in the civilized world. But this same mass of men is unacquainted with any religious or moral guide that may direct and control their efforts to obtain deliverance from the thraldom of ages. They are hemmed in on all sides by an army of officials which offers dogged resistance; which is as extortionate and oppressive as Pasha misrule. Can we wonder, therefore, that Nihilism found a suitable soil in Russia? Can we wonder that a populace driven to despair carries on a war of deliverance by terror and assassination against a gov-

ernment which tries to crush them back by sheer brute force into hopeless, passive submission? Or should we not rather wonder that a portion of Europe in the second half of the nineteenth century recalls to our minds the picture of some Asiatic tyrant in the far East, reigning, with apathetic indifference to their sufferings, over a number of turbulent hordes?

The revolutionary organ, *Land and Liberty*, refers in the following words to the draft of a constitution by Valousiff:

"A constitution is not what we want. What could we do with a constitution under present circumstances? So long as the country is denied all justice, a constitution would be of no use. Let us be given justice without distinction of persons and we shall be satisfied. But if the state goes on as before, our old programme must be maintained: 'Death to the Court camarilla and death to all criminal officials.'"

This violent and uncompromising language is not altogether unaccountable if we remember that according to official statements only about 700 out of 56,000 persons transported to Siberia had been sentenced by courts of law.

We disclaim emphatically any intention of writing an apology of Nihilism. On the contrary, we condemn the Nihilistic doctrines without qualification; for the success of the Nihilists would throw the empire into a state of complete anarchy, and anarchy is no basis for the formation of a government properly balanced between law and liberty. Russia cannot be placed by violent proceedings on a line of march toward the position occupied by the other states of Europe. We have merely desired to point out that individuals of all ranks of Russian society who are now in great numbers arrested, incarcerated, court-martialled, shot, or exiled to a living death,—that these individuals do not deserve to be classed with ordinary social conspirators, whether Nihilist or Communist or Socialist. The ill-will of an official or an unjust suspicion is quite enough to secure the forfeiture of life and property, and not seldom a sentence of death.

The past sufferings of Russia explain her present deplorable condition; and her past and her present sufferings appeal to us strongly for sympathy with the sufferers. Not by revolution, nor by anarchy; not by war, nor by a reign of terror can the political regeneration of Russia be accomplished. Even in ages which could not boast of the superior intelligence of the nineteenth century the exercise of despotic power has always been precarious. But the days are now past when despotism can successfully contend against the ceaseless encroachments of Christian civilization. Retreat into the dark ages of Asiatic barbarity is impossible. In vain, therefore, does the Russian Government try to oppose the acceptance of the rules and regulations by which the family of Western nations are

governed. The spirit of the age, demanding religious liberty and public freedom, is at work in Russia. Her greatest need is the introduction of those elements which will free the nation from the fatal effects of Peter's and Catharine's reign; that is to say, replacement of shallow superstition by true religion, and a fresh supply of vigorous sound moral principles.

The history of Russia serves as a warning example that the so-called Christian religions do not stand on one and the same level. Outside of the Catholic Church Christianity (so-called) has not been able to produce civilization in the true meaning of this much-abused term. Protestantism has reached a stage of rapid decomposition. The Greek Church is but a weak shadow of its former self. And in spite of the deepseated religious craving of the Russian nation, we see what the mock Christianity of that Northern despotism has led to.

And as the creation of the Russian Church has been an act of the Czar, so the abandonment of the false position which the autocrat of the North fills must likewise proceed from him. Any thorough and effective reform can arise only from the disposition and the wishes of the Czar, as long as he unites in his person the majesty, both civil and religious, of the realm. The influence of one who combines the legislative and judicial functions *de jure* and *de facto*, as the Russian Emperor does, can hardly be exaggerated, if but exercised for the benefit of the people. The genius of true religion, of true culture, of true civilization, clamors for admittance at the portals of the empire. This spirit addresses the judgment and the virtues of the Czar, begging to be established beneath the fostering aid of his prodigious power. This spirit tries to wrest from the present sovereign not an unmeaning, momentary triumph; not the shadow or the name of liberty, but something worthy of a great ruler and lastingly beneficial to the happiness of a great nation. This spirit tries to teach him to yield by a free act of his own volition those prerogatives which have become untenable, and which will be forced from his successors if not from himself. And this same spirit also assures him that order and tranquillity flourish better under civil than under martial law; and that a return to true religion, or at least to religious toleration and security of person and property, would gratify his fondest aspirations after fame, and engrave his name indelibly and honorably on the record of history. But whether these truths, which, we think, must force themselves upon the attention of the Czar, will receive due consideration, or whether fear and pride will withstand the appeal they are making to his better feelings and judgment, remains to be seen.

CARDINAL POLE.

The History of the Life of Reginald Pole. In two volumes. London, 1767.

Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury. By Walter Farquhar Hook, D.D., F.R.S., Dean of Chichester. Vol. viii., Reformation Period. London, Richard Bentley, New Burlington Street, Publisher in Ordinary to Her Majesty, 1869.

Rise and Growth of the Anglican Schism. By Nicholas Souder, D.D., Sometime Fellow of New College, Oxford. Published A.D. 1585, with a continuation of the History, by the Rev. Edward Rishton, B.A., of Brasennose College, Oxford. Translated, with Introduction and Notes, by David Lewis, M.A. London, Burns & Oates, 1877.

THE life of Reginald, Cardinal Pole is chiefly interesting to us from the steadfast devotion which it exhibits to the principle of Catholic unity. Not that it is otherwise at all unattractive; indeed, it is safe to say that from first to last it abounds in matter of a description most likely to win upon the reader. The singularly eventful period which it embraces, the historic importance of the personages and scenes introduced, its variety of incident, and the altogether uncommon cast of its leading features, arouse and rivet the attention as few lives have power to do. Many of these circumstances, however, independently of the special attractiveness which they may have in themselves, contribute greatly to heighten the interest which gathers about the main thought and motive of Pole's life. Whether we join him in the haunts of his literary leisure, or follow him on his generally unsuccessful embassies to royal and imperial courts; whether we view him as Legate to Trent, or on the point of election to the Papal See, we cannot forget that these various situations are incident upon, and, in a measure, the result of that decisive step which made him an exile and the object of prolonged and vindictive persecution for conscience sake. To the same cause must be largely attributed the alternate praise and blame heaped upon his memory. He has been exalted or cast down, glorified or defamed, according to the creed or religious bias of the writer. The motives which governed him were founded in selfishness and self-deception, or they sprang from an overwhelming sense of duty, just as his biographer happens to be of the same religious belief as his subject, or shares the antipapal animosity of his persecutor. While Catholics such as Phillips, for example, credit him in his consistent and strenuous opposition to the pretensions of his royal but ungodly relative, Henry VIII., with a fervor of piety and a depth of conviction equal to that which led

More and Fisher to the block, Dr. Hook labors with an assiduity, not at all compensated by his measure of success, to show that he was at heart a Protestant, but that "he mistook malignity for zeal," and, "through hostility to Henry, became a Papist." This latter opinion, it may be taken for granted, hardly meets the approval of the more fair-minded portion of Pole's countrymen.

Though it would be, indeed, a graceless office to tax with an intentional want of fairness one to whose thorough kindliness of nature, and uprightness of character, Mr. Gladstone has recently borne such eloquent testimony, yet there is no disguising the fact, that throughout his life of Cardinal Pole there breathes a manifest bitterness of prejudice, which makes its perusal absolutely painful. It is, however, gratifying to note, notwithstanding the misleading influence of works of this class, the quite general approach, among non-Catholics, to a more dispassionate and enlightened temper of mind in the discussion of Catholic questions. Canon Oakley, in a very interesting contribution to the June number of the *Contemporary Review*, graphically traces the manifold evidences of change, in this respect, which has passed over the English people during the last fifty years. It leads to the earnest and reasonably grounded hope, that the day is not so far off when the non-Catholic historical biographer will recognize the wisdom of treating with candor, if not with exact impartiality, the lives of men who, like Pole, in a period of doctrinal strife were identified with the defence and propagation of Catholic principles.

Reginald Pole was born in March, A.D. 1500. His birthplace is subject to dispute; some say Stourton in Staffordshire; Dr. Hook quotes and agrees with Dallaway in giving the honor to Lordington in Sussex. His father, Sir Richard Pole, a brave and devoted adherent of Henry VII., died before Reginald, his third son, had completed his fifth year; and the sole care of his children, four sons and two daughters, fell to their affectionate mother, Margaret, Countess of Salisbury. This illustrious lady was daughter to Clarence, Duke of York, niece of Edward IV. and Richard III., and, through her mother, Isabel Neville, granddaughter of Earl Warwick, "the proud setter-up and puller-down of kings." Her life pathetically illustrates the extremes of wretchedness and happiness which close kinship with royalty frequently occasions. Her earlier years were saddened by the loss of her brother, Earl Warwick, the victim of the dark policy of Henry VII., who beheld in him a possible rival to his son. His daughter-in-law, the ill-fated Catharine, sought in after years, by the strongest mark of affectionate esteem, to make her some slight atonement for the grievous wrong then inflicted. She was chosen sponsor in confirmation to the Princess Mary, appointed her governess, and invested with the general

charge of her household. In this way it happened that Margaret's children were brought into familiar intercourse with the members of the royal family. Reginald's beauty and nobility of disposition won him the heart of the queen. It was current, at one period, that she was eager to wed him to her daughter, the Princess Mary, and the scheme met with popular approval. On the other hand, Henry destined him for the highest honors of the Church. Whatever may have been Reginald's views on this matter, his talents were certainly of an order eminently suited to the churchman. He acquired the rudiments of his education in the grammar school of the Carthusians, at West Sheen, not far from Richmond. He was but twelve years of age when he entered Oxford, and there, three years after, he received his degree as Bachelor of Arts. In pursuance of his design Henry did his best to promote the ecclesiastical advancement of the young scion of the Plantagenets. Before he had attained to his twentieth year, he found himself in the possession of two prebends, and dean of Wimbourne Minster in Dorsetshire.

About this time he left England, where More, Linacre, Colet, Fisher, and others of high literary name, looked with pleasure on his budding promise, to pursue under Henry's munificent patronage the congenial life of letters. He took up his residence in Padua, then the first university of Europe. There the charm of his manners, the dignity of his birth, and the persevering zeal with which he applied himself to the study of the classics soon made him remarkable. It was not long before he became an object of general esteem. His splendid establishment was thronged with the representatives of Paduan wit and culture. During the five or six years of his residence in that "Italy of Italy," as Erasmus styles Padua, his fame as a scholar became widely spread. He counted Erasmus, Bembo, and Sadoleto in the number of his correspondents. The life of his friend Lougolius, written in Latin, and published prior to his departure from Padua, was his first literary venture. Happy in its treatment, excellent in its style, free from the insane Ciceronianism of the period, which made slavish imitation of the Roman orator the supreme test of merit in composition, it confirmed the general opinion of his talents and the perfection of his classical scholarship.

A short visit to Rome, where he was treated with every mark of distinction by the famous Matthew Giberti, interrupted his long stay at Padua, to which he returned for a brief space before setting out for England. At no period of his life, very likely, did Reginald Pole taste of pleasure more exquisite than during that which immediately followed his arrival home. His residence in Italy, besides marking his first absence from his native land, had been suffi-

ciently protracted to create both in himself and in his kinsfolk the keenest longing for reunion. The fame of his success abroad had been wafted home on many a breeze, and his triumphs in the arena of letters had now become the common talk. The court, to which he was most heartily welcome, had no rival to its brilliancy and culture in English records. The education of Henry was in the main scholastic; he knew more of Aristotle and St. Thomas Aquinas than of the practical duties of the statesman. "Shakespeare alone," writes Agnes Strickland, at the close of her eloquent panegyric, "Shakespeare alone has properly appreciated and vividly portrayed the great talents, as well as the moral worth, of the right royal Catharine of Arragon." Wolsey, the Magnificent, held the Great Seal; Thomas Linacre was Physician to the King; Richard Pace was Secretary of State; Cuthbert Tunstall was Master of the Rolls, and Sir Thomas More was Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. Even the Church could desire no better or more dignified representative of her learning and holiness than the venerable John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester. In such congenial society Reginald gave himself up to a season of unalloyed enjoyment. It was destined, however, to be of short duration. Vague hints and rumors of the king's dissatisfaction with Catharine, of his desire for a divorce, of his passion for a lady of his court, soon took form more substantial. It became public that the king questioned the validity of his marriage with his brother's widow, even though the impediment had been removed by dispensation; courts of inquiry were instituted. The case was referred to Rome, and, while professing to be willing to abide the Papal decision, threats alternated with prayers and promises in the effort to secure judgment in his favor. The shock of these events roused Pole to a keen sense of the painful nature of his position. To both sovereigns he stood in the attitude of debtor. In his boyhood he had been Catharine's special favorite. She was his mother's closest friend. It was her desire to bring about a marriage between her daughter Mary and himself, partly from the affection she bore him, mainly out of a spirit of vicarious reparation for the murder of his uncle Warwick. But, on the other side, Henry had proven himself a most generous benefactor. By his munificence he had been enabled to pursue his studies abroad in a manner suited to the dignity of his rank. He had been received on his return with the most evident tokens of his favor. It can hardly be doubted that Henry was naturally inclined to regard his brilliant and handsome young kinsman with a feeling warmer and stronger than that of mere esteem. So far as Henry's kindness could secure it a bright career lay before him. The embarrassment of his situation was daily becoming more evident. In a question so nearly affecting the wishes of the king and

the honor of the queen no member of the court could long remain neutral or inactive. Pending the Papal decision it was the course of prudence to keep aloof from the dangerous discussions and intrigues now rife in courtly circles. Anxious at once to escape from a scene so repugnant to his feelings, and to further perfect himself in the studies in which he delighted, Reginald sought and obtained the king's permission to retire from court and dwell once again among the tutors of his boyhood, the Carthusians of Sheen. At the end of two years the problem of divorce had grown more perplexed. In the minds of those best acquainted with the ungovernable temper of the king, and the calm, deep resolution of Catharine's character, there existed little, if any, hope of its satisfactory solution. With the lapse of time Pole felt his repugnance to interference increase. Acting on this feeling he besought Henry's leave to sojourn on the Continent. His request was somewhat reluctantly granted, and he proceeded to the University of Paris. Had he foreseen what was soon to follow he would have chosen to remain in his studious retreat. Despairing of success at Rome, where his agents were urgently pressing his claims, Henry turned to the universities, as if to counterbalance, with their purchased opinions, the anticipated failure of his suit before the Roman Pontiff. To his pain and amazement Pole found himself named president of a commission to obtain from the University of Paris an opinion in favor of the divorce. "Never," he says, some years afterwards, in his celebrated letter to Henry on the unity of the Church, "did I receive so sensible a stroke as from the disgraceful commission sent me when I was at Paris, whither I had retired that I might have no share in deliberations which were carrying on against the king's honor and interest within his own palace, under his directions, and by his authority." Rather than come to an open rupture with the king, of whose improvement he was still hopeful, he remained nominally in his ungracious office; and a couple of letters printed by Hook, as recently discovered, seem to show that he actually took some slight part in the proceedings; yet, after a year, so little had been done to further the object of the commission, that friends advised his return, lest the king might be led to regard him more as an enemy than as a friend. Accordingly he presented himself at court, and shortly resumed his studies at Sheen. A second two years spent in its monastic seclusion was destined to be abruptly ended. Wolsey, whose real greatness was best revealed in his repentance, had gone down to his grave, and the archiepiscopal chair of York was vacant. The policy of Cromwell and Cranmer, by which the king was now altogether guided, required that it be filled by one pledged to support the divorce, the very name of which was fast becoming obnoxious to the people. It was a great

office, and the name and weight of a great incumbent were imperatively needed to bring the balance of public opinion to turn in the king's favor.

Notwithstanding his youth, for he was only in his thirty-second year, the name of Reginald Pole was the first to suggest itself to the royal advisers. The spotlessness of his moral character shone with a lustre all the brighter from the contrast it afforded to a profligate court. His abilities were unquestioned. The Plantagenets were bound up in much of what was most splendid in English history. To the people the noblest representative of that illustrious race could never become an object of indifference. Moreover, his relations with the king were of so peculiar a nature as would seem to place him in the attitude of an absolute dependent on the royal bounty, and were taken as the strongest guarantee of subservience to his Majesty's will and pleasure. Even should this link fail, the sincerity and thoroughness of his affection for Henry could not be doubted. When, therefore, the Duke of Norfolk surprised Pole in his retirement with the dazzling offer of a Metropolitan See, on condition that he should oppose no bar to the divorce, he was at least equally surprised, as well as greatly chagrined, to meet with a decided refusal. After much urgent solicitation, and, in order that no direct offence might be given to the king, Reginald consented to take time for thought, and within a month submit his final answer. News of his hesitancy immediately brought his less scrupulous friends about him. It was the hour for a wise and courageous counsellor, and, at this crucial moment, Pole does not seem to have been thus blest. Representations of the most plausible nature were showered thick before him, and at last, against his own better judgment, he consented to satisfy the king. Overjoyed at the prospect of Pole's acquiescence, Henry appointed York Palace as the place of meeting. Never did an interview result in a more unexpected ending. Face to face with the king, the iniquity of the course which he was on the point of entering burst fully upon him. The specious reasoning by which he had been thus far partially blinded vanished the moment he summoned it to practically justify and support his conduct. Conviction and feeling were irresistibly on the side of Catharine; and Henry, instead of receiving, as he had been led to expect, the thanks of his favored kinsman, heard, with an astonishment and rage which he took no pains to conceal, a vigorous argument and passionately eloquent appeal for complete reconciliation with the queen. The unreserved and emphatic terms in which Reginald poured forth his innermost thoughts on this remarkable occasion may be taken as a declaration of principles on the fateful question of divorce, from which he never thereafter departed. The consequences of that

interview are plainly traceable throughout his after-life. Though Pole's conduct was a sharp disappointment to Henry, yet, in his calmer moments, he must have inwardly acknowledged that it was the surest pledge of his sincerity and devotedness. That he was deeply impressed by his kinsman's arguments is evident from the fact that, when the first outburst of wrath had died away, he commanded him to reduce them to writing. Referring to the document thus elicited, Cranmer observed that "it was written with so much wisdom that Mayster Raynold Pole might be of the council of the king's grace, and with such eloquence that, if it were set forth and known to the common people, it were not possible to persuade them to the contrary."

After the part Pole had taken it will be readily conjectured that his position in England grew daily more irksome. It now became his aim to withdraw himself from a scene where his presence, to say the least, must be regarded as a standing but unprofitable protest. Avignon offered a retreat most suited to his taste, and thither with the royal permission he betook himself, to begin what proved to be a long and eventful exile. At the end of a year, devoted to the study of sacred literature, his failing health warned him off to a climate more genial, and he removed to Padua, the scene of earlier studies and happier days. It is especially interesting at this period to note the growth of Pole's friendships. They were formed mainly with men standing on the topmost plane of literary and scientific attainment. A complete list of those with whom he was on terms of the most familiar and confidential intercourse, would represent a large proportion of the acknowledged leaders of Italy's religious and intellectual life. Bembo, "whose name," says Hallam, "among the polished writers of Italy, we meet with on every side;" Matthew Giberti, Bishop of Verona, the discipline of whose diocese was the envy of St. Charles; Sadoleto, great alike in the depths of his humility and learning; Morone, like Pole himself, a zealous reformer, a legate to the Council of Trent, and wellnigh the choice of a Conclave; Contarini, who was summoned from the council-chamber of Venice to the side of Paul III. as special adviser; the celebrated Hosius. All these became Cardinals, and that, upon a first acquaintance, such rare judges of human character should tender Pole their sincere friendship is a proof, not only of the singular charm of his manners and conversation, but also of the high order of his moral and intellectual endowments. Over others of natures not less noble he cast the same irresistible spell. With Lampidio and Buonamico, both men of great abilities, he bound himself in ties which only death had power to sunder. The Duke of Palliano and his wife, the beautiful and gifted Giulia Gonzaga, delighted in his society. He became after the death of Con-

tarini the adviser of a truly great woman, Vittoria Colonna, the widow of the Marquis Pescara. She was a poet who in that age of ripe culture wrote verses to equal Bembo's; she filled a daughter's place and exerted a daughter's influence over Michael Angelo. "I was born a rough model," said the immortal artist, "and it was for her to reform and remake me."

Through her in all likelihood it was that he became known to the grand old man whose declining steps she so lovingly guided and supported. It is not unreasonable to assume that Buonarotti was pleased with the noble and ascetic character of the young Englishman, and it may well be taken as a token of his esteem that he immortalized, what Agnes Strickland styles Pole's "grand person and features, the perfect model of beauty," in painting him as the Saviour in his picture of Christ raising Lazarus. In his own household we find a veritable "fidus Achates" in Luigi Priuli, a wealthy Venetian, who, as Dr. Hook justly remarks, "left his home and country to form part of Pole's establishment, or rather found his home and his country wherever Reginald Pole took up his abode." With Priuli we must class Beccatelli, his faithful secretary and biographer, and, after Pole's death, Archbishop of Ragusa; and Marco Antonio Flaminio, a poet, a man of the finest tastes, a classical scholar of the highest standing, and more than this, a Christian, whose tender yet solid piety was a spur to the ascetism of Pole. He must, indeed, draw largely on the good-will of fortune who could wish for his favorite a more distinguished and attractive circle. Such another company it would be difficult to find in Christendom; and it found in the grace, freshness, and intense religious earnestness of Reginald Pole an enduring attraction. But this was Italy, Pole felt, and not England. The brightness of his life was on the surface; its gloom lay heavy and deep on a heart that bled for its native land. There the scene was as dark and repellent as that in Italy was luminous and alluring.

Prior to his departure from England the royal supremacy had been declared by Convocation, of which Reginald by right of his ecclesiastical holding was a member, though absent when the disgraceful measure was enacted. Within the four years following affairs under the ministry of the unscrupulous Cromwell had taken on a gloomier aspect. Without sentence of divorce Henry had secretly married Anne Boleyn. Five months after this Cranmer pronounced a decree of divorce from Catharine, and declared the king's marriage with Anne Boleyn lawful. It had been repeatedly set forth by statute that the Pope had no more jurisdiction in England than any other foreign bishop. His name, by order of the king, was stricken out of all "books of the churches." Dispensations were, thenceforward, granted on the authority of the king

and the archbishops. It was declared treason to say that the king was either heretic or schismatic. It was treason to deny his spiritual supremacy. For refusing to acknowledge it Richard Reynolds, a Brigittin, John Haile, Vicar of Isleworth, and six Carthusians,—a name dear to Pole,—three Priors and three monks were martyred at Tyburn. Shortly after John, Cardinal Fisher, the wisest as well as the most illustrious of Henry's anointed victims, calmly approached the block reciting a passage of St. John's Gospel on which his eye had chanced to fall: "This is everlasting life to know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent." On the fourteenth day following the blood of Sir Thomas More gave to that same block a new consecration. Events soon made it quite manifest that the spiritual supremacy of the king would prove a costly matter to the "Church" which he had condescended to govern. By act of Parliament the first fruits and the first year's revenue of all benefices were granted to the king for the support of his new office. The dissolution of the lesser monasteries for the good of religion, and the sequestration of their property for the good of the king, was enacted, soon after, by the same august assembly. It was evident that the savagely despotic course on which Henry had now fully entered must result in irretrievable injury to the ancient religion. German heresy had already obtained a foothold in the land, and throve under the shadow of the Anglican schism. The religious instincts and convictions of a whole people were not to be ruthlessly violated without eventually creating a deplorable havoc in its morals. The transfer of spiritual allegiance, under penalty of death, from the successor of Christ to the heir of Henry VII. was a blow at legitimate authority most favorable to a second religious revolt. From schism to heresy is perhaps an easier step than that which leads from orthodoxy into schism, and it is hardly a matter for surprise if many who found themselves schismatics, by obedience to the ruling of a tyrant, should under the impulse of passion or a desire for change, or won by the charm of novelty, lapse yet farther from the truth. To this pass had matters come in England, and thus far there had been no open rupture between Pole and the king. Had Reginald been resident in any part of the realm during this period, there can be no doubt but that he would have shared the fate of Fisher and More.

The execution of these great men made it plain that no claims of former affection, of personal obligation, of public service, of eminent ability, of high and sacred station, of saintly life, would be suffered to weigh with the king if opposed even by silence to his sacrilegious usurpation. It was left for Reginald Pole to discover that not even inoffensive absence was able to secure a suspected

subject from the effects of the royal vengeance. What seemed a kindly wish was expressed by Henry and his Machiavellian minister, Cromwell, for Pole's return, on the ground that the benefit of his great acquirements was now needed in England. Had this invitation reached Pole two years earlier it would have been accepted; as it was it came far too late, and the lure failed. He was then requested to write a treatise in favor of the royal supremacy. The message met with the only answer it deserved—silence. Dr. Starkey, a former friend of Pole, was next commissioned by Henry to obtain his candid judgment on the questions of supremacy and divorce. At the same time Cromwell wrote urging his return, no matter what his opinions on the vexed questions might be. In a letter to Starkey he promised compliance, expressed the affection he still bore the king, and his desire to do him real service; but still, for the sake of the dear ones at home, he put off his answer. A second and a third time Starkey was directed to write and demand an explicit statement of his views on the questions proposed. Pole could be silent no longer. The time had arrived, at last, when come what might the thoughts and feelings which had long burned for utterance must have issue—at how dire a cost he could scarcely have imagined. Good Queen Catharine was at rest. Five months had not elapsed from the day of her demise, when Anne Boleyn displayed her vindictive levity on the scaffold. It seemed to Pole that now if ever the time was come of making Henry remorsefully conscious of the enormity of his crimes, that now if ever his repentance might be looked for. Under the pressure of these motives, overcharged with the conflicting memories which Henry's reign suggested, he flung himself into the composition of his celebrated treatise, *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*. His own analysis of the work, and description of the circumstances which led to its production, as sent some years later to Charles V., are interesting.

"Many reasons concurred to reduce me to the necessity of undertaking this subject. The first of which was the king's positive commands to write, though not indeed against himself, yet the subject on which he ordered me to send him my opinion brought on this consequence. I had retired from my country and friends, at a time when they became most dear and necessary, that I might have no share in measures which I could not approve and must have been involved in had I stayed. I should have been under a necessity either of acting against my own conviction, the king's honor, and the welfare of my country if I consented to what he required; or, on my refusal, of provoking his indignation against myself and all who belonged to me. My tenderness for him, however, was such that no authority, no persuasion had yet been able to make me depart from the resolution I had taken of being silent on these matters, though several persons for whom I had the greatest deference were of opinion I ought to have acted otherwise. He sent, therefore, his commands when he had not the least reason to suspect I should interfere with his proceedings; when there was no farther room for deliberation; when his resolution was taken, and he had made it capital for any one to oppose it. This law was enacted with such vigor that no merit

however conspicuous could screen those whom it included. The two greatest lights which this island had seen[1] were put to death for refusing to comply with it. These examples he knew were come to my knowledge, and he vainly imagined the terror of their influence, and the desire of returning to my own country and acquaintance, which otherwise I must forever relinquish, would bring me to a compliance; and, in that case, my authority would be of greater weight with my countrymen, as I had hitherto been more backward in yielding to his will. His orders were that I should send him my opinion in terms so clear and explicit as to exclude all ambiguity and subterfuge, and if I failed in so doing I should incur his highest displeasure. Had the case been of a doubtful nature and not openly repugnant to the divine law, the affection I bore my country and relations might have been a powerful inducement to act as I was required. For as to the penalties with which I was threatened, and the violent deaths of those great men which were placed before my eyes, they were so far from alarming my fears that I saw in them the strongest motives to support with an unshaken resolution the cause in which they had lain down their lives. And if the alternative was not to be avoided, I would have renounced whatever was desirable rather than purchase the enjoyment on the terms which the king offered. . . . The work is divided into four books. In the first of these I refute the supremacy the king has taken on him self, and a treatise written in defence of it, which by his orders was sent me from England. The second asserts the prerogative of the See of Rome, and answers the objections made against it. In the third I sound in the king's ear the voice which the guiltless blood he has shed and the horror of his other actions raises up to heaven against him. Having thus discharged what I owed to truth and my country's welfare I cast myself at the king's feet; I conjure him to take in good part what I had said, as it proceeded from zeal and affection, and on this consideration to excuse me if anywhere I seem to exceed those bounds which custom has prescribed to subjects when they treat with their prince."

From the appearance of the book in England may be dated the relentless persecution to which Pole was subjected up to the time of Henry's death. It was not the custom of the age to mince phrases, and there were certainly very few qualified expressions to be found in Pole's denunciation of the king's conduct. During his long reign no subject had ever dared to address royalty in a tone approaching it in boldness. Its stern severity of rebuke, as used towards a sovereign, has never been surpassed. Even Contarini, to whom he submitted his work for revision, was startled at its indignant frankness. Pole's justification rests mainly on the fact that he intended it for the perusal of the king alone, and as a proof of his sincerity in this respect he could never be persuaded to publish it until, some years after Henry's death, a pirated copy, disfigured with the most malicious comments, having appeared in Germany, he determined at last to give it to the world under his own name. Moreover, it never would have been written had not gentler measures utterly failed, and there was besides no one in England in a position to send the king a perfectly free and candid remonstrance on the iniquity of his proceedings. Henry masked his rage beneath an assumption of calmness. Pole was commanded on his

[1] Fisher and Moore.

allegiance to return immediately. "This," observes the sagacious Dr. Hook, "was the proper and dignified course to be pursued, though the advocates of Pole represent it as an absurd proceeding. It placed Pole entirely in the wrong if he refused." Reginald himself gave terse expression to his thoughts on this subject when, quoting the fable, he said: "I have seen many animals go into the lion's den but I never saw any come out." The burden of the numerous letters which were sent to him was identical, and pointed to a common source of inspiration: "Obey the king." Reginald answered: "I will return to England when I can do so with honor and safety. Repeal the law which makes it death to deny the royal supremacy."

A breach of this sort with Henry was sufficiently alarming, as Pole keenly felt, to endanger his personal safety; and the drift affairs were taking in Italy could not fail to widen it. The attitude of the English court towards Rome was, of course, one of open hostility, and that any subject of Henry should hold friendly and official relations with the See which had pronounced against the divorce, was regarded by him as tantamount to treason. The throes of the religious disturbances agitating Europe were convulsing its politics as well as its morals. Governments felt the ground of opinion and principle on which they rested heaving, shifting, dividing beneath them. The necessity was evident of convening a General Council in which the radical causes of religious discontent might be fully investigated and remedied. As a preparatory step towards this important end Paul III. summoned to his side the holiest and ablest counsellors in Italy. Reginald Pole was surprised by a Papal brief commanding his assistance in the preparation of subject-matter for the deliberations of the prospective Council. With his usual candor he made haste to apprise the king of his movements by instantly dispatching a copy of the brief to Cromwell. In company with Caraffa, Sadoleto, Cortese, and others, he was at Verona, on his way to Rome, when a courier from England arrived, bearing letters from Cromwell, Tunstall, his mother, and Lord Montague his brother, dissuading him from attendance at the Papal court. The situation was a trying one. A further advance might result in ruin to his kindred, yet the commands of the Pope were not to be lightly disregarded. Pole hesitated, and sought the advice of his companions. Their unanimous counsel decided his course, and he continued his journey to Rome, where he was royally received and assigned quarters in the Papal palace. A commission of nine, of which Reginald was the youngest member, was appointed under the presidency of Cardinal Contarini to consider and state the proper matter for reform. Its labors extended over a space of two years.

According to Phillips, Pole was "the directing mind that governed and guided the whole." As the best recognition of his abilities and services he was charged with the draft of its report, and when a few years afterwards it was thought advisable to make that report public, it appeared over Pole's signature alone. He was but a few months in Rome when he was named member of the Sacred College. The choice met with general approval, though in England its chief effect was to embitter more deeply the mind of its unprincipled monarch. While Reginald himself was sincerely grateful for the honor, he was notwithstanding somewhat unwilling to accept it. Thus far he had not so much as received tonsure. His leanings, however, were towards the Church, and on the 22d of December, 1536, he became an Ecclesiastic and a Cardinal. It was hardly two months prior to this event that a formidable insurrection had broken out in the north of England, among those who had determined to put a stop, at all risks, to the spoliation of Church property incessantly carried on by the minions of their schismatic ruler. They marched under a banner representing the crucifixion of Christ, as significant of the wounds under which his spouse was suffering. Enthusiasm was intense and widespread. The issue, however, was not a gain for the insurgents. Nevertheless, the outbreak was a sign full of promise to those who hoped for the spiritual well-being of England. As such Paul III. regarded it. He was of opinion that the time was now come when, with a reasonable prospect of success, an effort might be made to bring Henry to a course of conduct more consonant with the welfare of religion. To the Pope as well as to the ambassadors of Charles V. at Rome and London, no one seemed so likely to succeed as the newly-made Cardinal; and, on their advice, he was named to what Dr. Lingard rightly terms "a very delicate but dangerous mission." Pole had not concealed from the king his real sentiments with regard to the right of the people to seek a redress of their grievances. In his work on the Unity of the Church, intended, as has been said, solely for the eye of the king, he had frankly declared that the repeated violation of the rights guaranteed by Magna Charta to Church and people, had dissolved the contract which made allegiance a duty. But these convictions he did not seek to propagate. To use a simile of his own, he sought to heal the disorders which afflicted the body of his native land by applying a remedy to the head in which they originated. He sought the salvation of his country not by force of arms, but by force of reason. It was, therefore, quite natural, and to be expected, as a part of the consistent line of conduct which he had followed throughout in his dealings with the king, that on receiving his credentials as legate to the courts of France, the Nether-

lands, Scotland, as well as to the people of England, he should forward to Henry an account of the scope and aim of his instructions. These were, as he wrote to Cardinal Pio, to promote a peace between Charles V. and Francis I., to dispose them to the convocation of a General Council, and endeavor, through the mediation of Francis, with whom Henry was at peace, to win the latter back to the Communion which he had abandoned.

He had not yet set out from Rome when a remonstrance reached him, signed by many members of both houses of Parliament, condemning in the severest terms his work on the Unity of the Church, and his conduct in proceeding to Rome and acceptance of the Cardinalate against the wishes of the king. He seized on the opportunity to justify himself, and made of his answer a masterly vindication of the course he had adopted. In language at once eloquent and temperate, he cited the arguments already noted as a sufficient apology for his treatise. Then referring to himself he said: "What is the reason, my lords and gentlemen, that I have been so long deprived of my country, my relations, and of everything that is dear to man? Why am I an outlaw? Why is a price set upon my head? Am I driven from home from any crime of mine or of those I belong to? Did I want means or ability to rise to honors in my own country?" He appeals to his memorable refusal of the See of York in proof that the king's honor and welfare were dearer to him than any emolument. And then, touching on the charge of disobedience, he shows that neither in his residence at Rome in submission to the Papal command, nor in his recent elevation to the Sacred College, was there anything inconsistent with his former conduct or with his duty as a loyal subject.

To trace at length Pole's career as a legate would encroach too largely on the narrow limits of a sketch such as this. It was made up of a succession of grievous trials hardly relieved, except for the consolation he derived from communion with God, and the comfort he received from the deep and tireless sympathy of his friends. The vengeance of Henry met him everywhere. He arrived in France to find its king, intimidated by threats, practically opposed to the success of his mission. He was requested to leave the kingdom, informed that he had been declared guilty of high treason in England, and that a reward of fifty thousand crowns was offered to the assassin who should dispatch him. He withdrew to Flanders, in the hope of favorable treatment from its sovereigns, Charles V. and Mary, the nephew and niece of Catharine, to be told that its Privy Council had been tempted with an offer of four thousand infantry, fed and furnished for ten months, on condition of his delivery into the hands of Henry's agents. Spies dogged his movements; bravoes lay in wait for his steps. The august dignity

with which he had been invested was, with good cause, deemed no sufficient security. Yet, under the weight of these unexpected trials, he did not suffer his patience to give way; nor, in the face of imminent danger, did he allow his serenity to be disturbed. His self-command under the stress of such circumstances reveals a new aspect of his character, and it was equal, as we shall see, to the strain of an ordeal as painful as man is called on to endure. If we lift the veil from his life, during the three months that he remained in the hospitable abode of the Prince Bishop of Liege, we are edified and charmed at the ascetic simplicity of its daily routine. The recitation of the Divine Office preceded Mass. An extract from St. Bernard was read before dinner, and a chapter from a Latin version of Eusebius's *Preparation of the Gospel*, was given by the translator, Matthew Giberti, immediately after it. An interchange of thought, in pleasant and instructive discourse, succeeded, and the company separated to meet again toward the close of the day, to chant the remaining portion of the office, and after supper to listen, on alternate evenings, to the Cardinal's exposition of St. Paul. The unsuccessful result of his embassy had no power to check the joy with which he was welcomed back to Rome. He was still a favorite with Paul, and early the following summer accompanied him to Nice, and was present at the truce agreed on between Germany and France. As if to atone for former coldness, Charles distinguished him by special marks of his confidence and esteem. The promises the Emperor then made to succor the suffering Catholics of England were never fulfilled. A second mission, undertaken by Pole with this object to the Spanish Court, met with no better fortune than his first. Bitterly disappointed at the double dealing of Charles, he quitted Spain and hastened to join his friend, the venerable Sadoleto, at Carpentras. Thence he was recalled to Rome, and in the course of the following year, as a recompense for his services, appointed to the government of that part of the Papal dominions known as the "Province of the Patrimony." His administration was marked by the zeal and clemency which rank among the foremost qualities of his noble character. His promotion seems to have added to a constant danger. At Rome a body-guard was deemed necessary for his protection, but he was not long in the discharge of the duties of his office at Viterbo, the Capital of the Province, when three Italians, in the pay of Henry, were legally convicted of plotting his assassination. The extreme severity of their punishment Reginald commuted to a brief imprisonment. The failure of one attempt, however, was an incentive to another. Ere long Pole had again occasion to signalize his clemency, this time towards two of his own countrymen, engaged by his unrelenting enemy to carry out the same dire purpose. After

a few days' service in the galleys the order came for their liberation. Fully to appreciate this magnanimity it must be borne in mind that Courtenay, Marquis of Exeter, Pole's kinsman, and Lord Montague, his own eldest brother, had been put to death by Henry on the mere suspicion, real or assumed, of disaffection, and that during the period which had since elapsed his mother had been kept a prisoner in the Tower. The worst was yet to come. Maddened at his repeated failures, Henry ordered the venerable Countess of Salisbury to execution. Ill treatment had not quenched her spirit. Brought to the scaffold, she refused to lay her head on the block. "That," she said, "is for the heads of traitors; not for mine. If you must have it, take it as best you can." As she fell under the stroke of the headsman she was heard to exclaim: "Blessed are they who suffer persecution for justice's sake." Reginald was at Viterbo when the fact came to his knowledge. Beccatelli describes it in a way too pathetically interesting to be omitted. "I was with him when he was informed of his mother's death, and it was on the following occasion: He had received several letters from France, Spain, and Flanders, and having read them, he called me, as his custom was, to return the answers. As I was putting them together I perceived one of them to be in English, and told him I need not take that with me, as I did not understand the language; to which he replied, without the least emotion: 'I could wish you did, that you might read the good news it contains;' and on my replying, 'I hope your Excellency will make me partaker of it;' 'Hitherto,' he said, 'I have thought myself indebted to the divine goodness for having received my birth from one of the most noble and virtuous women in England; but from henceforward my obligation will be much greater, as I understand I am now the son of a martyr. The King has caused her to be publicly beheaded for her constancy in the Catholic faith, though she was seventy years of age, and after his own children the nearest to him in blood. This is the recompense he has thought fit to bestow for the care of his daughter's education and long attendance on her. But may God's will be done, and may He, at all events, be thanked and praised.' On my being seized with surprise and horror at this relation, 'Be of good courage,' he said, 'we have now one patron more added to those we already had in heaven.' Having spoken thus, he retired to a private oratory, and having passed some time in prayer, he came out with his usual cheerfulness."

The administrative ability of Cardinal Pole was still employed in the government of his province when, in 1542, after many delays, Paul III. issued the Bull "Initio nostri," convening a General Council at Trent, and the Governor of Viterbo was summoned to exert

his talents in a station more conspicuous. The legates appointed were the Cardinals Parisius, Morone, and Pole. Fresh difficulties arising, the Council was indefinitely adjourned. Two years past away before it opened its first session. Pole was again named legate, this time in conjunction with the Cardinals Del Monte and Marcello Cervini, both destined to be respectively the next occupants of the Papal chair. The wrath of Henry was not yet extinguished. Pole was on the point of setting out for the Council when he was warned, by a letter from the Cardinal Bishop of Trent, of a plot to assassinate him on his journey. Compelled to put off his departure he made use of his leisure to compose an excellent treatise—inserted by Labbe among the decrees and canons of the Council—on the nature and end of General Councils. He finally proceeded under an armed escort to Mantua, thence he journeyed by less frequented ways safely to Trent. Here unremitting service and an uncongenial climate told heavily on his health, and he retired to Padua. On its restoration he was kept at Rome to act as Papal Counsellor in the intricate questions debated in the Council. The course of the next three years witnessed the removal by death of two sovereigns, Henry and Paul, who in their relations with Pole were contrasted as his greatest enemy, and his greatest benefactor. The friendship of the Pope began where that of the king ended, and the reasons which endeared him to the former occasioned the hatred of the latter. It may be justly said that the measure of his standing rose in Rome in a degree proportionate to its fall in London; and if the character, not only of the rulers themselves but of the men by whom they were surrounded be taken in consideration, no higher testimony of Reginald Pole's merit as a man and as a Christian may be imagined. Beccatelli and Priuli entered with Pole as his attendants into the Conclave which elected Paul's successor. In their long and familiar intercourse with him they had the amplest opportunities of forming a correct estimate of his exalted character. They knew how calm and even cheerful he could be under reverses, how forgiving under the gravest injuries, how perfectly his own master under trials the most agonizing; but adversity is not the only touchstone of moral greatness, nor perhaps the truest. To a truly great mind and heart, for the vast scope and numberless instrumentalities it affords of well-doing, no prize is so tempting to the soul blinded with earthly ambition, none so overwhelmingly dazzling, as that which it is in the power of the Conclave to offer. That of which Pole was a member lasted above two months without being able to declare its choice. Throughout this protracted period of suspense neither the agitation of his companions nor the growing probability of his own election availed to disquiet him. To its close he preserved his tranquillity unbroken,

devoting his spare hours to the composition of a dialogue on the *Duties of the Papacy*. At last the necessary majority was secured. It was night in the early part of January. Pole was roused from sleep by a deputation of Cardinals, come to request his presence in the chapel to receive the homage of his associates. "I cannot approve," replied Pole, unmoved, "of any hasty or tumultuous proceedings. Put it off until to-morrow, and if it is God's good pleasure that I be elected it will happen then as well as now." On the morrow the coalition formed overnight was dissolved, and on the 7th day of February, 1550, Cardinal del Monte was chosen and ascended the Papal throne under the name of Julius III. Pole returned to Viterbo, whence he was frequently summoned by Pope Julius for counsel. Three years' further service as Governor of the Patrimony determined him to give up an office which he had admirably administered for twelve. His health was now broken. The ties which had bound him to life were nearly all sundered. Gasper Contarini was dead, so was Bembo and Giberti, Sadoleto and Vittoria Colonna.

An address on union with the Holy See, to the Privy Council on the accession of Edward VI., had failed to evoke the answer his soul thirsted for. At Magguzzano, a monastery of the Benedictines, of whom he was Cardinal Protector, he entered on what he intended should be his final retirement from public life. Little did he dream of how splendid a mission was to glorify the evening of his days. The death of Edward in 1553 placed Mary on the throne, and opened the fairest prospect of England's reconciliation with Rome. Reginald Pole was immediately called forth from his retreat. It was known that Mary's early affection for him had deepened, and with ample reason, as time went on. Her first and dearest recollections were associated with his name. In the dark days when no man else had courage or fitting opportunity to speak, he was the champion of her mother's honor, and, therefore, of her own. The sufferings he had endured in that cause were not less than hers, and, so to say, their very counterpart. There could be no doubt, therefore, that any advances made through Pole, looking to the religious pacification of England, would be favorably received. He was once again accordingly appointed legate with ample powers, and the entire project committed exclusively to his management. His mature age and experience, knowledge of his countrymen and of the manifold and peculiar difficulties besetting the execution of his design, combined to make him act with extreme caution. He proceeded slowly. His first step was to dispatch a letter to the queen by a secret messenger, disclosing his appointment and seeking her advice as to the time and circumstances most likely to conduce to the success of his embassy. In

her answer Mary pledged herself to secure the abolition of such laws as were opposed to the religious welfare of the people, and requested him to come invested with full authority for the settlement of all matters necessary to a perfect reconciliation with the Holy See. Unforeseen and vexatious interference, however, put off his return far beyond the term prescribed by prudence. He had no sooner set foot in the imperial dominions than he was met by an order forbidding his advance. Under various pleas he was prevented for more than a year from pursuing his journey. Letters were brought him from the queen stating that the people were not yet disposed to receive him, that Parliament thus far had not repealed obnoxious statutes, that his attainder was still unreversed, that his appearance in England would be attended with serious commotions, and be made at the risk of his life. On the part of the emperor, who beheld in Pole a rival to his son, the negotiation of a marriage treaty between Mary and Philip furnished a pretext for indefinite delays. Meanwhile the legate's instructions led him again to attempt the fruitless task of making peace between monarchs who were unwilling to be reconciled. He returned from the court of Henry II. to that of Charles, to find rumor busy with charges to his disadvantage and to the injury of the main object of his mission. About this time he wrote to Philip, who was now King of England as well as Prince of Spain, urging him to allow no further hindrance to be put to the fulfilment of his office towards England. "It is just a year," he says, "since he knocked at the door of Philip's house. If Philip were to say, 'Who's there?' the answer might be, 'One who for twenty years had been exiled from his home and country to prevent her from being excluded from her home whose home is now shared by Philip.' If as such a one he were to demand admittance he might expect the door to be opened to him. But it was not as a private man that he stood there; he was knocking as the representative of the successor of St. Peter; yet, strange to say, while the ambassadors from every other realm are freely admitted, the ambassador of the first among kings and pastors upon earth is waiting at the outside." The letter was effective.

By the marriage of his son the jealous fears of Charles were quieted, and even his sinuous policy could invent no fresh excuse to stay the legate's departure. The tide had turned; the inexhaustible patience of more than a score of years was about to receive a fitting reward. For being a thorough patriot Reginald Pole had been declared a traitor. Philip and Mary went to the House to see his attainder repealed, his rights restored, and his conduct vindicated and applauded. Honors came thick and fast upon him. A deputation of forty gentlemen, headed by the Lords Hastings and Paget, was sent to Brussels to bring him to England.

His progress homeward was a triumph. A royal yacht and ten of Her Majesty's men-of-war waited for him at Calais, and on the 20th of November, 1554, he landed at Dover. His arrival in England was hailed with a genuine outburst of enthusiasm. The tale of his sufferings melted the popular heart. The country rose to do him honor and give him hearty greeting. He was saluted as a herald of glad tidings, a messenger of peace. After all that had been said and done for a full generation to root out allegiance to the See of Peter, it was evident that the spirit of loyalty still dwelt in the mass of the people. The gentry and nobility, as well as the clergy, thronged about him, and he was borne along from place to place in the midst of a splendid pageant. Everywhere he was met with unequivocal signs of reverential affection. At Canterbury, with the royal permission, he assumed the insignia of his high office, and cross, and pillar, and poleaxe were carried before him as he continued his way from the See of St. Thomas. At Gravesend he took the gorgeous state barge prepared for him, and, accompanied by a gayly decorated flotilla, was swiftly rowed up the Thames to Whitehall. Here Philip and Mary received him with a cordial welcome, and upon leaving he was conducted by Lord Chancellor Gardyner and a large number of the nobles to the palace, magnificently furnished for him at the queen's cost, at Lambeth. The crowning hour of Pole's checkered career was close at hand when the great work, so much in harmony with his gentle, loving, and deeply religious nature, was to be accomplished. It was the hour of reconciliation for which, with his whole soul, he had prayed and wrought, and when, as he had fondly hoped, the religious dissensions of his country were to have an end, and the old time peace of the Catholic unity was to possess the land. Both Houses of Parliament were summoned to meet together at Whitehall. Thither on the morning of the appointed day—the 28th of November—Pole proceeded, and in company with the king and queen was ushered into the Hall of Assembly. Gardyner opened the proceedings in an address, stating the object of the legation, and closed it by introducing Cardinal Pole. And he had need of an introduction. A new generation had grown up since he had been last seen in England. Old men who remembered Reginald Pole in the flush and exuberance of his youth found it hard to recognize him in the wasted, yet stately form of the venerable personage who rose to address them. Before its time old age had set its stamp upon his features. A mild expression softened the austerity of his aspect, and even before he opened his lips the hearts of the gazers were drawn towards him. A breathless silence pervaded the assembly as in a low and feeble voice he expressed his thanks for the reversal of his attainder, and his reinvestiture in the rights of which he had been

unjustly deprived. "But," said he, "in return I have come to restore to you rights which you have forfeited, and enable you to become inhabitants of a heavenly country. And as you have repealed the acts which made me an exile, now that I am restored to my native land I ask you to repeal the statutes against the Church, by which you have made real exiles of yourselves." The following day the feast of St. Andrew was made memorable in English annals. The representatives of the English people in its sovereigns, its peers, spiritual and temporal, its commoners, were come together to take part in a proceeding which stands solitary in their history. Such a position as Cardinal Pole filled on that day has never had its parallel. It was the day of his triumph; and the triumph was not official only, it was, likewise, eminently personal. He was there, not simply as representing the Vicar of Christ, and, as such, bringing back a nation to the obedience of the Chief Shepherd; it was he—Reginald Pole—whom God had chosen to do it. He, the hunted outlaw, on whose head a price had been set, who was come back to receive from the power which had declared him worthy of death an acknowledgment of its fault. Cromwell had once savagely said: "I'll make this Cardinal eat his own heart;" and while he himself was yet in exile, Cromwell had paid penalty for his misdeeds to the executioner. The vengeance that had so long pursued him had broken and lifted and vanished like a cloud. The double cause for which he had suffered was in the ascendant. The work of his foes was undone. The daughter of Catharine stood by his side the anointed queen of her father's subjects. The doctrine of royal supremacy had just been solemnly abjured. In a few moments, the absolution, which it was his duty to bestow, would put an end to the schism which Henry had created. Surely the Lord had arisen and his enemies were scattered. All preliminaries had been brought to a close when the Cardinal, in a spirit of thanksgiving and gratitude to God, rose to perform the great function with which he was charged. As he did so the entire assemblage knelt. Extending his arms he pronounced clearly and distinctly the form of absolution which restored England to the Catholic communion; and as, in conclusion, he traced in the name of the Trinity the absolving sign above the prostrate throng, a glad Amen, Amen, burst forth from every side. Te Deum was then chanted in the royal chapel; after which Pole indited a brief dispatch to the Pope, acquainting him with the joyous intelligence. And so the proudest and happiest day of Pole's life came to an end.

The affairs which occupied his few remaining years may be briefly summarized. A great work lay before him, and though he grew daily more infirm his spirit never flagged in its performance.

He found England, in all that regarded religion, in a state of almost absolute anarchy. From the date of the royal supremacy, ecclesiastical property, movable and immovable, had passed in great part into the holding of laymen, who were determined never to relinquish it. Among the clergy strict discipline no longer existed; and faith had weakened and piety was at a low ebb among the people. It was for him to build up where others had pulled down; to restore fervor where laxity and lukewarmness prevailed; to reduce confusion to order; to bring harmony out of the clashings of discord; to lift up with God's help, not one diocese, but an entire kingdom to the plane of an active and energetic faith. It was indeed a stupendous task, but Pole was not to be affrighted. The problem of England's and the world's reformation was long familiar to his thoughts. His manhood had been spent among men of the highest order of mind, who had made a life-study of this very subject. He himself was among the foremost of those who had given shape and fashion and impulse to the immortal council whose sessions were yet far from being concluded. Had he lived, had he been let alone, there is no doubt but that he would have succeeded. In reviewing this period of history Ranke did not hesitate to say of him: "He was the man above all others best fitted to labor for the restoration of Catholicism in England. Affairs proceeded most prosperously under his guidance." And when Pius IV. succeeded to his austere predecessor, Paul IV., he said: "Had Cardinal Pole been supported in his measures England might have been retained with perfect ease." In attempting a national reformation, he adopted the only course which could ultimately issue in success. A leading difficulty which faced him on the very threshold of his labors was the question of the sequestrated abbey lands. This difficulty, however, his instructions had anticipated, and he was enabled to bring it to a prompt and satisfactory termination. With his concurrence, Parliament guaranteed and secured the ownership of such property to the present owners and their heirs forever. By this act alone a great step was made towards subsequent measures of reform. It was an evident and indisputable earnest, on the part of the Supreme Pontiff, of candor and good-will to a somewhat doubting people, and therefore calculated to inspire confidence and bring about that mutual and perfect trust essential to a solid and lasting reformation. While this act was producing its effects on the nation, Pole was maturing his plans for its spiritual advancement. A year had passed away since his arrival in England before he deemed the time ripe for the convocation of a national synod. The matter submitted to its consideration, and which received its sanction, he had drawn up in the form of decrees, only twelve in number, but

so clear and comprehensive in statement that they body forth a perfect system for the administration of the Church, the training and regulation of the clergy, the religious instruction and edification of the people. A splendid tribute to the wisdom and piety of Cardinal Pole, as displayed on this occasion, is contained in the just remarks of his biographer, Sir Thomas Phillips. "The resemblance," he says, "of the decrees here made to those which the Council of Trent made on the same matters is very remarkable. Nor can it be replied, that the legate adopted what had been already ordained in that celebrated assembly; because whatever has any affinity to the statutes of the synod was not regulated till the last sessions of the council, which were held some years after the Cardinal's death. But it is not improbable that several of the Fathers who assisted at them were acquainted with what he had ordered on matters which they were to regulate, and that they prescribed to the whole Christian world what he had approved of for one national Church."

The scope of Pole's influence, however, extended far beyond the limits which bounded his efforts at reform. The news of his success in England had lifted him to the pinnacle of popularity abroad, and confirmed his right to a foremost place among the statesmen of Europe. Letters of congratulation poured in upon him. Among them it is a pleasure to find one from Ignatius Loyola, in which he expresses his joy at the happy turn of affairs, gives a cheering account of the Roman college, and points out its advantages for the education of such youths as the Cardinal might think proper to send. With scholars Pole had always been a favorite. Whatever had to do with the advancement of learning was sure to receive his hearty support. The universities of Cambridge and Oxford recognized this fact in his career, and testified their high sense of it by electing him chancellor. It was not until the 20th of March, 1556, that Cardinal Pole ascended to the priesthood. On the second day following he received consecration to the primatial see, at the hands of Nicholas Heath, Archbishop of York, assisted by six suffragans of the Province of Canterbury. His conduct as primate embodied what he had urged in synod; but though his zeal was ardent it was never fierce. The brief reign of Mary, in which he bore so prominent a part, has for three hundred years, whether justly or unjustly, been singled out for especial stigma. With the question in which that stigma originated we are but slightly concerned. It is a sufficient vindication for Cardinal Pole, if indeed vindication were required, that armed with powers above those of any ecclesiastic in the kingdom, at a time when Parliament was hungry for slaughter, he set his face against persecution. The clemency of his nature only followed the dic-

tates of his judgment. The weight of historical testimony in his favor reaches its climax when Burnet quotes him as saying: "Pastors ought to have bowels even to their straying sheep; bishops are fathers, and ought to look on those that erred as their sick children, and not for that to kill them."

It is sometimes the lot of good men to be utterly misunderstood by the good; and this bitterest of experiences was reserved for Reginald Pole when his course on earth was nearly run. No two men could offer a contrast more strongly marked than that exhibited by the Cardinals Pole and Caraffa. The habitual sternness and severity of the latter was the very antithesis to the tenderly gracious manner and nature of the former. Both aimed at the accomplishment of good, perhaps with equal conscientiousness; but the means used for its attainment were as dissimilar as their natures. The lenient and conciliatory policy of Pole in England could never have been employed by the austere founder of the Theatines; and hence it happened that when Cardinal Caraffa became Paul IV. Pole's legative powers were withdrawn. Reginald bore up under the Papal displeasure with the unruffled calm which had characterized him under earlier trials; but, nevertheless, the shade had fallen on him from the seat of that authority which he had strenuously upheld and defended throughout life; and it remained until it was lost in the deeper shadow of his death. This event took place on the 18th day of November, 1558. During the sickness which preceded it intelligence was brought him of the death of Charles V. and of the illness of Queen Mary, who was dying of the same disease which proved fatal to himself. Expressions of mutual sympathy passed between the sufferers. In sorrow and in joy their lives had taken the same course, and from the same causes. On the same day, it may be said, death sealed the harmony of their lives. The queen departed this life sixteen hours before the Cardinal. He had already received the sacraments when word came to him that Mary was dead; but, wishing once again to receive his Lord before seeing him "face to face," he would be brought before the altar. There in tears the dying Cardinal recited the "Confiteor" and communicated. He was brought to his couch. Vespers and compline were said in his presence; and shortly after, while his attendants read the prayers for departing souls, the last Catholic Archbishop of Canterbury entered into his rest.

A study of Cardinal Pole's character impresses us with the idea that he was morally, rather than mentally, a great man. His life, it is true, abounds in evidence of his intellectual pre-eminence, and the judgment of his age leaves us no room to doubt it; nevertheless, it is in the circle of duty, rather than in the arena of thought, that we are commonly led to regard him. We forget his rank as

a scholar, his dignity as legate, his influence on the intellectual activity of his day, in the contemplation of a life of serene endurance and constant self-sacrifice. His sufferings are ever before us, and if we rejoice in his successes and exult in the tributes conceded to his merit, it is mainly because they tend, in some measure, to their alleviation. It is the analysis of this feeling of sympathy which leads us up to the true conception of his character. The secret of his influence over us lies in his exquisite sense of right, and in his inflexible resolution in acting up to and abiding in it. His misfortunes flow from this source; and we are touched by them, not simply because they are misfortunes, but because they are incurred in defence of the right. His life is the expression of this principle. It is the only one which can afford a rational explanation of his conduct. The divorce was a gross violation of natural right, and therefore he opposed it. The schism was an outrage on revealed truth, and hence he devoted his life to the task of closing it. And it is this principle, too, which constitutes his charm, not only when it appears in affairs of public concern, but also as it is seen operating in those of a purely private and personal nature. If he is tranquil and patient under the annoyances which beset his various embassies; if, even though a Cardinal, he is accustomed to serve Mass at Viterbo; if he pardons the criminals who sought his life, and forgives their abettor; if, after the murder of his brother, he expresses, in writing, his willingness to lay down his life for the salvation of the king; or, in the Conclave, displays the heroism of perfect self-control; in all these things we recognize the grandeur of a soul which made its conception of right the aim and rule of action. His goodness is, beyond question, his strongest title to greatness. This fact is his highest praise; for the names of men intellectually great are common in history, while the names of those who were also pre-eminently good are comparatively rare.

THE RECENT ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF POPE LEO XIII.

ON THE NECESSITY OF REINSTATING THE CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY OF ST. THOMAS IN CATHOLIC SCHOOLS.

OF the many documents that have come forth from the Holy See within the memory of living men, few can be counted that surpass in importance the Encyclical which we have considered it a duty to place on record in the pages of our REVIEW. In this noble effusion of apostolic zeal and learning our Holy Father, Leo XIII., following in the footsteps of his illustrious predecessors, has thought fit warmly to recommend, both to those who are already learned and to those who are striving after true knowledge, the study of the volumes of St. Thomas Aquinas, known in the schools as the Angelic Doctor. He further discloses a praiseworthy anxiety to restore the scholastic philosophy of the Middle Ages and of our fathers to the old place of honor which it once held, and whence it has been cast down, or allowed to fall, through the contempt or negligence of our supercilious and superficial day and generation.

And if we but consider the fervid welcome and unbounded joy with which it has been everywhere received and greeted, it must be acknowledged that the Encyclical has met the wishes and gratified the cravings of the Catholic heart throughout the whole world. From every city of Catholic Italy, from the so-called centres of civilization, Paris, London, and Berlin, to the remotest isles of the southern seas, there has gone up to Heaven one common voice of praise and acclamation. Its words have evidently touched a responsive chord and awakened a thrill of delight in every orthodox breast. Nor is the reason of this difficult to understand. The Apostolic Letter emanates directly from the mind and heart of the great Pontiff himself, every syllable of it being manifestly his own; and we can only raise our hands in silent wonder, joy, and thanksgiving as we listen to those words of matchless eloquence which enhance, instead of impairing, the ardor and persuasiveness of reasoning and exhortation in which the Teacher and Father of the faithful pours out his whole soul to his children.

Nor has the Encyclical failed to elicit impartial consideration and even admiration from many of those who profess to regulate their philosophy and their religion by their own private judgment. And their calm, respectful examination and approval of the document may well make us forget the senseless ridicule or blind fury with which some writers, stanch disciples of the gospel of hate,

have assailed the words of the Holy Father. Acting on the foregone conclusion that nothing good can come out of Nazareth, they deliberately close their eyes and ears to the noble language, the unstudied tone of fatherly tenderness, the lucid statement of facts and reasons that would bring conviction to any unprejudiced mind. Others, while highly praising the Encyclical, cunningly pervert their very praise into a weapon of calumny, by which to overthrow the fixed, unalterable character of the teaching of the Church and its Supreme Head. They extol Leo XIII., but it is only to depreciate Pius IX. They tell us that Leo, in commending the study of philosophy, exalts reason, and has remedied the mistaken policy of Pius, who condemned it. This is sheer invention, as gratuitous as it is malicious. There is not a single word in the Syllabus of Pius IX. (for this is what is referred to) that can be tortured into condemnation, or even the faintest shadow of censure, of human reason, its legitimate rights, or its correct use. If it does, let it be produced. It does not breathe on this matter a single syllable which every right-minded Protestant, who has not parted company with his former belief in revealed religion and Christianity, would not cheerfully subscribe to. It condemns those only who do not use reason, but *abuse* it; those who lift it out of its proper sphere; who make of it a judge of the mysteries of Christian faith; who contend that theological must be discussed in the same way as natural science; and, finally (not to enumerate them all), who are bold enough to say that philosophy must be treated without any reference to supernatural revelation. As if the speculation of any philosopher, had he even the mental calibre of an Aristotle, an Augustine, or an Aquinas, could possibly be true when in open contradiction with God's revealed Word.

It is these men, who trample on the mysteries, miracles, and teachings of the Old and New Testaments, who insult and blaspheme God and his revelation in the name of reason, that Pius IX. condemned in the Syllabus. And we should like to be told when or where they have ever found favor and approval at the hands of the present Pontiff. Not in the present Encyclical, surely; in which, like Pius IX., he teaches explicitly that reason must know her place and keep it, nor venture beyond her depth. Her duty, and it should be her highest boast, is to be the handmaid and follower (ancilla et pedisequa) of theology and revelation. She must never have the presumption to withdraw herself from the control of divine authority (non ita tamen, ut auctoritati divinæ sese audacter subtrahere videatur). Let her remember that it is trampling alike on faith and reason to accept as true any conclusion which is opposed to revealed doctrine (si conclusionem aliquam amplectatur, quam revelatæ doctrinæ repugnare intellexerit). In the next para-

graph he scouts, not only as a fallacy but as the height of folly and ingratitude, the notion (already condemned in the Syllabus) that human intelligence loses its dignity, and becomes fettered and enslaved by subjecting itself to divine authority. All this is, or ought to be, so well and widely known, that it is a pity and a shame that we have here to repeat it. But the blindness of the enemies of the Holy See is so deepseated and incurable, or their ill-will so perverse and persistent, in insinuating on every occasion and through every possible channel, from the brief cable-message to the elaborate article of the journalist and reviewer, that there is some conflict of doctrine between Leo XIII. and his predecessor, or at least some radical difference of policy in dealing with the erroneous opinions of the day, that the Catholic writer is compelled, most unjustly and at the risk of tiring out the patience of his readers, to keep on forever denying this shameful falsehood, protesting against its repetition, and challenging its proof, which never yet has been, never will be given, for it does not exist.

The true doctrine of the Church touching human reason, Leo XIII. holds in common with Pius IX.; and St. Thomas centuries ago had held the same. This doctrine forms the groundwork of the whole philosophical and theological teaching of the Angelic Doctor, as any one even superficially acquainted with his writings must have discovered. According to St. Thomas, all truths belong either to the rational or to what may be called the super-rational order. This means that while the former are within the sphere of reason, the latter are above and beyond (*not* against) reason. It means further, that the former may be first discovered and then proved by reason; but the latter, being beyond her sphere or order, can never become known to her by any investigation of her own, and should she by any extraordinary means arrive at a knowledge of their existence, she never can *demonstrate* them, in the strict sense of the term. To attain even the limited knowledge of their existence, which is all she is capable of, there is needed a revelation, or manifestation of them from outside; and such manifestation can proceed only from that higher sphere to which she can never soar. As to entity, there is no difference between the truths of the two orders, but only as to quality; or, to speak more correctly, as to the relation in which they respectively stand to human reason. Hence it is evident that truths of the one order, no matter how widely they may differ because of that relation, can never contradict those of the other. For the highest and last reason or ground of the truths of both orders is to be found only in God's infinite wisdom, and this can never contradict itself. Hence, though occasionally the attempt be made to argue from reason against revelation, that is from truths of the lower order against those of the

higher, on close examination it will be found invariably that such arguments or objections resolve themselves into idle conjectures (the possible so disguised as to assume the shape of the probable), or futile sophisms. But, in the name of reason herself, what power can mere possibilities, much less sophistry, possess to overthrow any truth, the existence of which has been sufficiently ascertained? The human mind, if it start from true principles and proceed logically, has never yet succeeded, and cannot by any possibility ever succeed, in reasoning out of existence any revealed truth.

The knowledge of supernatural truth that is acquired by reason is historical. That is, from a Supreme Intelligence she learns the fact that there exists a certain truth, or body of truths, of which the existence was hitherto unknown to her, and—taking into account her limited faculties—must have remained forever unknown without the agency of the Revealer. But is human reason limited to this historical knowledge? In other words, must she content herself in mere belief in the existence of those higher truths on the authority of the higher Intelligence? No; this would be to ignore or undervalue the dignity, rights, and even duties of reason. St. Thomas, or rather the Church taught of God and teaching through his pages, requires that reason, within the almost boundless extent of her proper sphere, exert and exhaust, if possible, in the study of revealed truth all those noble gifts and powers with which she has been invested by her Maker. Mere assent is not enough. It is the duty of reason, since she has the power, not to demonstrate revealed truth by intrinsic arguments (for of this she is incapable), but to search out and discover the many lesser proofs that serve to confirm them; proofs drawn from analogies and congruences with truths of the natural order, and with the things of this visible, sensible world, which contain in themselves some resemblances of God and his hidden truths (aliquale vestigium in se divinæ imitationis *retinent*, as the saint says, no doubt with reference to the primeval curse). These are so many clues that will aid and cheer reason in her speculative study, provided she keep from the presumption of seeking to demonstrate or fancying herself able to comprehend (dummodo absit vel comprehendendi vel demonstrandi presumptio). She may likewise, with uplifted eye of contemplation, endeavor to trace out, as far as she may, the mutual relations of these heavenly truths; and if it be not given her to discern the entire chain that binds them together in everlasting harmony, at least to catch a glimpse here and there of its golden links. The other duty or privilege, as it may well be called, of reason—a part of what Pope Leo calls its *honorable service*—is to aid religion by weighing in the scales of true philosophy the objections or difficulties raised by pseudo-philosophers against re-

vealed truth, and, having thus discovered their emptiness, to expose it in the face of the world by showing that they are either the necessary result of wrong principles or the outcome of illogical deduction. They can be nothing else, since no truth can contradict another, and therefore will always admit of a solution.

These privileges are enjoyed, and these duties discharged to the full extent, or at least on an ample scale, by the professional Christian philosopher. But the same also, to the limited extent of their abilities, is done by the humblest of God's faithful servants, under the guidance of their pastors and teachers. Hence it comes, that a Catholic child or peasant, if he be fully instructed in his catechism, is quite competent to teach those who pride themselves on their worldly learning many and most important truths, of which they knew nothing, with their relations and consequences. He knows, too, how to answer the difficulties proposed against his faith, and often so effectually as to bring the blush of shame and confusion upon the cheek of the scoffer and unbeliever.[1]

We have given the doctrine of St. Thomas, as stated by him in the last two chapters (seventh and eighth of book i.) of what may be called the prologue to his *Summa contra Gentes*. In what, we ask again, does it differ from the doctrine enunciated by Pius IX. in his Syllabus, and by Leo XIII. in his Encyclical, or from the teachings of any Pontiff who ever sat on the chair of St. Peter?

The newspapers and the cable telegraph have invented a similar

---

[1] We have now in our mind a case of the kind that happened not long ago in a neighboring State. A poor, but worthy man, who was nearly destitute, came one day to the door of a respectable family, and, stating his condition, asked for any employment that would secure him his daily bread. He was engaged for some service on their farm, and gave satisfaction. But his accent told the country of his birth, and this, with perhaps an occasional sign of the cross, made known his religion. Neither was in favor, but rather looked down on with contempt in that section of country; and, as he seemed utterly devoid of even the first elements of education, it was thought that an attack upon his religion would not only result in amusement from his ridiculous answers, but in an easy triumph over his evident ignorance. He was accordingly questioned and bantered on the "objectionable" points of his creed by the most intelligent member of the household. But the good man, though ignorant of most other things, had been thoroughly trained in his catechism; and this alone would have made him more than a match for a score of divines from Princeton or Geneva. His answers were so calm, so clear and correct, so logical, and finally so impressive, couched as they were in the choice language of Bishop Butler, that the tables were soon turned, and the laugh, or the defeat rather, proved to be on the wrong side. The questioner was not only vanquished, but dismayed and terrified into the conviction that answers so simple, yet so cogent and logical, must rest on some basis of truth. This brought about a serious examination of Catholic doctrine, and the examination was followed by submission to the Church. And this conversion happily led to that of the whole family and of many others. These facts are well known throughout the county of the State where they happened, and will be recognized by many readers of the REVIEW.

story about the Jesuits and their opposition to the teaching and measures of Leo XIII. We are gravely told that they have reluctantly and at a late hour sent in their adhesion or submission to the doctrine of the Encyclical and the Pope's commendation of St. Thomas, but that such adhesion is believed to be insincere by the authorities at the Vatican. This only shows that anti-Catholic prejudice is prepared to believe anything, provided it bear hard upon the Pope or the Jesuits. No Catholic need be roused to anger by this absurd statement, for we are sure that the Jesuits, whom it most concerns, only laughed heartily when such nonsense first came to their ears. For three hundred years or more, ever since the order existed, all the great teachers, professors, and learned divines among the Jesuits have gloried in being disciples of the Angelic Doctor. His *Summa* was their text, on which they wrote their commentaries. The lights of their illustrious body are those who were most imbued with the doctrine and spirit of St. Thomas. Look at the great names of Toletus, Vasquez, Suarez, Gregory de Valencia; or examine in our own day and country—not to mention European celebrities—the writings of Fathers Hill, Mazella and De Augustinis. And this not only from affection and esteem of the Holy Doctor, but from obligation. For the constitutions of the Society make it imperative on all the members to follow his teaching as their guide. All this is as much a matter of known history, as that the Order was instituted by St. Ignatius, or confirmed by Paul III. in 1540. And now we are asked to believe that the Jesuits are beginning to do under compulsion, with reluctant heart and feigned obedience, what they have been doing all along cheerfully, lovingly, and from a sense of duty arising from self-imposed obligation, for the last three centuries and a half. Wonderful Jesuits! they are the stronghold of the Church and of her enemies. If a reviler of our doctrines is struck dumb in argument with his opponent, he falls back upon the Jesuits, and tries to hide his confusion by invoking their name. So, too, with the cable news-gatherer. When he has nothing to send to his gaping crowd of cis-Atlantic readers he does the same, and summons the Jesuits to his aid. He knows that anything bad he says of them will be welcome. The worse it is, the better.

As long as the principles of St. Thomas flourished philosophy was orthodox no less than theology. But his principles, and with them his system, did not long remain in universal honor. The Renaissance soon came and begat the Reformation; and the Reformation in its turn paved the way for all the monstrous forms of infidelity that are the grief and shame of our day. It is customary, but scarcely correct, to look upon Rationalism as the direct offspring of Protestantism. The germ of Rationalism is as old as the

Renaissance, which, in its turn, is improperly confounded with the revival of letters. The latter was a blessing for which Europe was indebted to many causes, but especially to the guidance and fostering zeal of the papacy and the Church. But the former name more aptly designates the first rise among Christians of the great Rebellion of men's minds against the yoke of Christian Faith. It was the resurrection in Europe of the spirit of Paganism,—which was supposed to have received its death-blow in its last struggles with the Church under the Diocletians and Julians of the decaying Roman Empire,—the spirit of revolt against God and His supreme authority. The Reformation was only its further development, and must have come sooner or later under some other name had Martin Luther never existed, or had the Catholic Church never taught the doctrine of indulgences. And, growing with the growth of centuries, the same foul spirit has in our day become so widespread and so powerful that it begins to aim at absolute lordship over the whole civilized world. Within the memory of our fathers it obtained some share of sovereign power for awhile, and history records the horrible results, the havoc and ruin, that it brought about in its few years of rule. Baffled and defeated, it yet lives. Nay, it is growing rapidly in strength and influence, and, still worse, daily encircling within its deadly folds the very men who seemed to be its conquerors; and unless civil society can be speedily awakened from its torpor, thoroughly alarmed and terrified into precautionary measures for the preservation of its own existence, by the dreadful prospect of what is to come, this accursed spirit will once more gain the mastery, and deluge Europe with blood and untold horrors, by the side of which the excesses of sans-culottes and communards will appear like the gentle breeze of spring compared with the hurricane of autumn.

It was not so much from the false philosophical systems which attempted to displace that of St. Thomas that modern irreligion has come into the world; it was rather the irreligious spirit that introduced them, in order to subserve its own aims, and facilitate its own propagation. And it has no reason to complain of its success. No doubt there were other causes or pretexts that helped to do away with the authority of the Angelic Doctor and his school. The Humanists began by disliking his writings and those of his followers, because of what they considered the inherent barbarism of the scholastic language. They ended by abjuring, condemning, and ridiculing a philosophy which they deemed irreconcilable with the classical Latin, which they worshipped with blind idolatry. For such men all philosophy was nonsense, unless it were set forth in the round, eloquent periods which Cicero used in his Tusculan disputations, or sung in the bold, majestic numbers with which

Lucretius had graced his poem, *De Rerum Natura.* Some, like Marsilius Ficinus, hating both Aristotle and St. Thomas, sought refuge from the fancied barbarism of the schools in the elegant musings of Plato. But the so-called Reformers especially hated beyond measure the doctrine and system of St. Thomas. Nor is this to be wondered at; for its principles and logical method were fatal to the new religion they had invented and were trying to build up in place of Catholic truth. Neither structure nor foundation could stand the test of logic, and they knew it.

Besides there were not wanting even good men, as in our own day, who, led astray by a mistaken zeal for the overthrow of error, abandoned St. Thomas, and, in order to confute the new Rationalism, founded a system which, unhappily, was based on the very principles they were seeking to destroy. This was the case with Des Cartes, a right-minded man, it cannot be denied, and of the most orthodox intentions. But what could religion or true philosophy gain by a system based, as its author acknowledged, on grounds of skepticism? His theory succeeded only in encouraging others, Catholic and Protestant philosophers, to try their hand upon improving it; in other words, to do their best to make it more skeptical, and thus willingly or undesignedly become helpers in promoting the cause of irreligion. But why pursue this downward progress? It is enough to say that from the day in which St. Thomas and his school were set aside things grew ever worse, until at last philosophy, from being the teacher of knowledge, was dragged down to the pitiful task of teaching men how to know nothing and to doubt of everything. We will say nothing of the Malebranches, Lockes, Condillacs, and others who attempted to unravel the genesis of ideas and trace out the ultimate sources of human knowledge, and who, instead of shedding light on the subject, have darkened it still more, and left it a hopelessly tangled labyrinth for those who came after them. The attempt to search into the origin of ideas and bridge over the gulf that separates the subjective from the objective, seems easy enough to the rational thinker who walks in the old beaten path of Christian philosophy; but the solution of this difficulty has become the *crux* and terror of modern ideology.

The history of philosophy plainly shows how lamentably this groundwork of all science, since it rebelled against the authority of the schools and sinned by voluntary surrender of the known truth, is responsible for its own sad condition. Pagan reason failed to solve the great problems of thought, soul, and Deity, owing to the infirmity of fallen nature and the gradual fading away of primitive tradition. But Christian reason that freely perverts itself, and presumes to glory in shaking off what it calls the shackles

of revealed truth, must not only fail, but fail ignominiously in punishment of its wicked pride. And this precisely has been its fate. Since the old system of the Catholic schools, consecrated by the reverence of ages, was contemptuously flung to the winds, it would be hard to tell how many ridiculous systems of mock-philosophy have strutted their brief hour across the stage of the learned world and then disappeared forever. And these systems, born of mere caprice, have gone on increasing in wickedness as well as in folly. Pyrrhonism, Empiricism, Sensism, Materialism, Idealism have appeared on the scene, each boasting in its turn, after the fashion of quacksalvers, that it was the only sovereign remedy for intellects that had lost their way in searching after truth. Now they are almost entirely swallowed up by Deism, Pantheism, Pessimism, Nihilism, and all the other high-sounding names that disguise what in plain speech is called Atheism. They do not object to the name of God, provided He be confounded with individual man or with the universe, or relegated to the Unknowable. But the idea of a personal living God is absurd; and (as one of themselves says) "the worst hindrance to human perfectibility." "Belief in God," says another (Professor Marre), "is the cause of all our social misery. The road to happiness is Atheism. No safety on earth as long as man holds on by a thread to heaven. Man must be taught that there is no other God but himself. He is the superior being and the most real reality." And so what "the fool" of Scripture only ventured to breathe in the inmost recess of his heart, "There is no God" (Psalm xiii. 1), is now fearlessly uttered by scores and hundreds of teachers, who pass for philosophers and men of superior intelligence. And this not only in the professor's chair or in learned treatises written only for scholars, but in newspapers, pamphlets, tracts, and writings designed for circulation amongst all, even the lowest classes! Not a month has passed since Garibaldi, the honored guest of British princes and nobles, the idol of the American Protestant world, wrote a letter addressed to a brother Atheist, Cairoli, in which he repeats that the idea of God is "a falsehood," and that "it was not God who created man, but man who created God." And the saddest reflection of all, showing how unbelief has crept into the hearts of so-called Christians, is that this horrid blasphemy will not lose him the admiration, reverence, and affection of even one of his anti-Catholic worshippers, who claim the name of Christians, either in England or America.

The canker has eaten its way into the moral, social, and political order, and threatens to involve them in the common ruin. The difference between good and evil has become an empty name, and success or failure the only test of merit or of guilt in human ac-

tions. The sacred, inviolable relations of parent and child, husband and wife, that are inherent in nature and established by nature's God, are no longer considered binding, but are severed at will by the authority of the state or by individual caprice. All rights, personal and of minorities, even those of the soul and conscience, may be set aside and trampled upon by the iron will of the majority, or by the arbitrary decree of what happens to be the ruling power. The only supreme law for individuals, communities, and even nations, is the *jus fortioris*, the law of brute force. In other words, might makes right, and is its only legitimate source. These pestilential doctrines, imported from Europe, have found a welcome and a home amongst us, in a country where correct ideas of right and wrong and rational freedom once existed. We have listened to them in the ravings of congressmen and high officials of the government, and on the judicial bench. We have heard their echo even in the pulpits of Christian churches. We have seen them not unfrequently reduced to practice during the last fifteen or twenty years.

The new philosophy set out with the vain boast of elevating and ennobling man at the expense of the divinity. It has ended by sinking him to the level of the beast. It has done away with those noble prerogatives which put him on a footing with angels and prove his resemblance to God, to whose likeness he was created. The Marres teach us that thought, reasoning, judgment are only the result of organized matter; or, to use their own elegant expression, "secretions of the brain, like other secretions that come from the kidneys or other organs;" the Tyndals and Huxleys tell us how we came of our father, the monkey: the Von Hartmanns, that "we should study our true being in the ox and the hog, and learn from them the philosophy of living as we ought." A notorious Atheist philosopher, who died three years ago in Berlin, relates of himself that he used to sit for hours fondly contemplating a hideous baboon that formed one of the chief attractions of the Zoological Garden of that city, gazing (as he says) with mournful interest on his undeveloped ancestral type. And thus the philosophy that was ushered into the world with such pomp and pretence, that was to set man free and edify him, has come down at last to "pig science," to the "philosophy of Pigdom," as they have been not unaptly styled by Carlyle, one of themselves, though not of the boldest or advanced ranks. He is a skeptic who believes only in his own vapid dreams, which, to impose upon simple readers, he sets off with quaint speech and oracular airs. How well do such swinish philosophers verify the words of Holy Writ (Psalm xlviii. 20, 21): "Homo cum in honore esset, non intellexit: comparatus est jumentis insipientibus et similis factus est

illis!" That is, man lifted up to the highest pinnacle of honor by his Maker would not use his intellectual gifts in His service. He chose rather to cóme down to the level of the brute creation, and make himself thoroughly like unto them.

Some writers, in expressing their opinion of the Encyclical, say it will be impossible to bring men back to the study of St. Thomas and his philosophy. It is, they say, antiquated, barbarous, unintelligible. What do these critics mean by antiquated? Is it simply that it has grown old? But truth by growing old loses none of its vigorous or intrinsic worth. Is it that it has become obsolete? But truth, if it be such, can never become obsolete. This happens in physical science, which is chiefly built on conjectures and hypotheses; and these are discarded because they are found to be false by new and more careful experiments, or by the discovery of what was hidden from those who went before. But what experiment or new discovery can overturn a metaphysical truth? The human soul has had from the beginning the same consciousness that it now has, and the laws of reasoning never change. Geology, chemistry, and other branches of natural science shift their theories from day to day; but metaphysical truths are unchangeable, above all when they have been strengthened by the additional sanction of revelation. If it is simply meant that the system has been abandoned by some, this is true. But we have seen that it was no good reason that led to this abandonment, and that the results have been most disastrous. The system of St. Thomas is yet cherished in very many Catholic schools, and their number is on the increase, instead of diminishing. He is disregarded, it is true, by many outside of the Church, but that does not prove him obsolete; as well say that logic is becoming antiquated because it is not taught, or very little of it, in most Protestant colleges and seminaries.

Let us come to the charge of barbarism. Is the style of St. Thomas and the scholastics nothing more than a barbarous jargon? No one who has read the magnificent Latin hymns of the Saint can fail to know that he ranks as one of the foremost among Christian poets. Since the days of Prudentius there are few, if any, that can be found to excel him. And of the latter it may be said that he surpasses St. Thomas in poetic coloring, but is, perhaps, inferior to him in unction and noble simplicity. But this was to be expected. In the days of Prudentius the Christian muse yet wore some of the fetters of her Pagan education. But, long before the time of St. Thomas, she had been purified and thoroughly Christianized. She now possessed a language of her own, and had forgotten that of Egypt. To accuse the author of the *Pange Lingua* and *Lauda Sion* of "barbarous jargon" can only prove utter reck-

lessness or profound ignorance on the part of whoever thus accuses the Saint. His Latin may not be the Latin of Lucretius and Tully, but it is good in its kind; and language must change where the whole current of human thought has been radically altered. This was effected by the introduction of Christianity into the Roman Empire. It is true that St. Thomas, in his purely scholastic works, purposely avoids any attempt at elegance of diction as inappropriate. He considered such elaborate trifling unworthy of his theme. He goes directly to his object, omits every unnecessary word; and those that he has chosen as fittest to convey his thought he places in their logical order, and therefore avoids all inversions that might savor of rhetoric or please the ear while distracting the attention. But what higher praise could be given to any didactic writer? Nor must we be so thankless as to forget that it is, in a great measure, to the scholastic method of writing Latin that modern languages are indebted for the accuracy of their philosophical construction and sequence, and so far surpass the old languages, so full of inversions, allowed and favored by their varied inflexions.

But St. Thomas is unintelligible. To one who talks thus—not from ill-will or a determination to find fault with the Saint at any cost, but merely because he has heard others talk in the same strain—we may briefly answer: "You speak in this way because you are as little acquainted with the Saint as you are with Zerdusht or Trismegistus. Read him, judge for yourself, and you will avow yourself mistaken." If he should reply that by unintelligibleness he means only obscurity, hair-splitting, refining, and distinguishing with such minute subtlety as to bewilder the reader, we will again answer: "This you have only on hearsay, and from men who pretend to have read and understood the German philosophy of the period. Now read for yourself a page or two of St. Thomas, chosen at random, and then take up and read a like amount in Fichte, Schelling, or Hegel. If you are disposed to be candid, you will confess that compared with them St. Thomas is like the noonday sun compared with Cimmerian gloom." These great interpreters of modern thought are deliberately talking nonsense which neither themselves nor their readers can understand, and very likely it was not their intention to be understood. But St. Thomas, on the contrary, writes like one who is conscious of being the interpreter of truth, who believes and understands what he says, and who is earnestly striving to make his readers understand and believe. What shall be said of him who professes to have read the Saint and our modern owls of philosophy, and then assures us that he readily understands the nebulous German phi-

losophers, but finds St. Thomas unintelligible? We must mistrust either his honesty of speech or his capacity of understanding.

The departure from the philosophy of St. Thomas marks the downfall of all rational philosophy, the decay of all moral and political truth, and the beginning of what we may call the unscientific handling of even physical science. It was time, therefore, for Leo XIII., not only as Head of the Church, but as hereditary guardian of civilization, to come to the rescue and do what lay in his power to restore the ancient landmarks, by which in better days, days of true progress, the course of philosophy and of all science was regulated. He has spoken to all, directly to those inside of the Church, indirectly to all who yet retain any reverence for Christianity, to do whatever can be done against the torrent of false philosophy which threatens to engulf human society.

And what is to be the final upshot of this movement? Are we justified in directing the reader's hopeful eye to better times, to the advent of a new era, in which everything shall wear a happy, joyful look?

"Aspice venturo lætentur ut omnia sæclo!"

This would be presaging too much. The life of the Church, God's kingdom here below, is what holy Job pronounced the life of individual men to be, "a warfare upon earth." And this, too, is the promise made her by her Divine Founder. While it is her privilege to be guaranteed entire freedom from every taint of error, she is nevertheless to be forever assailed and buffeted by storms from without and griefs from within. *Foris pugnæ, intus timores*, is the record of her past history, and is to be that of the future. One of her most fruitful sources of trouble comes from those "gates of hell," which are ever sitting in council, devising schemes, or waging fierce war upon her everlasting battlements—a war as ceaseless as it is unavailing—for she holds in her hand God's pledged word that they shall never prevail against her. Another undying source of affliction to this divinely-commissioned Teacher is the pride of human understanding, which, when unchecked by the wholesome restraints of Divine Grace, and encouraged by the haughty prince of fallen angels, will submit to no control and overleap every barrier. Hence it is justly punished by being allowed to fall daily into the most shameful and humiliating errors. These false opinions, backed by the power and the fashion of this world, penetrate everywhere; and, in spite of the constant vigilance and warnings of the Church, make an impression on some incautious Catholics, weaken their allegiance, and lead them away into doubt or denial.

Now, it is very unlikely that the arch-enemy of God and of His work of Redemption will ever give up his hatred, his wiles, his

habitual plotting against the Church; nor is it to be expected that fallen, unregenerate man will be brought easily to relinquish his pride of intellect, which is one of the greatest obstacles to the possession of divine, and even of natural truth. There will always be enough left upon earth of Satan's warfare, and of wicked opinions as they go on vanishing and returning in their periodic cycles. But may not some important results, in the interest of revealed religion and human society, be confidently looked for from this weighty and well-pondered action of our Holy Father, aided (as it most assuredly will be) by the zeal and co-operation of all possessed of influence and of learning throughout the entire Church, and seconded (as there is some ground to hope) by the good-will and endeavors of not a few outside of her communion, who detest impiety, bewail the growth of irreligion, and would fain see the dangerous or wicked systems of modern philosophy replaced by something more in harmony with that Christianity which yet retains its hold on their understanding and their affections? We think there is every hope of it; and that the whole body of philosophical doctrines and the style in which they are taught will be, if not entirely regenerated, purified at least in great measure, and elevated from their present unsatisfactory and degraded condition. The Infernal Serpent will lose a great deal of the influence he now wields over the souls of men, since he set himself up and was accepted as their teacher. His reign in the schools of philosophy and pretentious false science will be stripped of its supports and consequently shorn of its present power, and a goodly amount of that deceitful crop of wicked opinions and teachings, with which the fields of literature and philosophy are now wild and rank, will be unsparingly swept away by the hand of time and of Reason when she will have regained her true place and just prerogative. And thus will be verified, in part at least, that happy event which the great poet, drawing evidently from something higher and nobler than Pagan sources, predicts as a necessary consequence of that better age, to which our hearts are now looking forward with fond hope and lively expectation:

> "Occidet et Serpens, et fallax herba veneni
> Occidet."

EPISTOLA ENCYCLICA LEONIS PAPÆ XIII.

SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI

LEONIS

DIVINA PROVIDENTIA

PAPÆ XIII.

EPISTOLA ENCYCLICA

Ad Patriarchas, Primates, Archiepiscopos et Episcopos Universos Catholici Orbis Gratiam et Communionem cum Apostolica Sede habentes.

Venerabilibus Fratribus Patriarchis, Primatibus, Archiepiscopis et Episcopis Universis Catholici Orbis Gratiam et Communionem cum Apostolica Sede habentibus,

LEO PP. XIII.

Venerabiles Fratres, Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.

AETERNI Patris Unigenitus Filius, qui in terris apparuit, ut humano generi salutem et divinae sapientiae lucem afferret, magnum plane ac mirabile mundo contulit beneficium, cum caelos iterum ascensurus, Apostolis praecepit, ut *euntes docerent omnes gentes;*[1] Ecclesiamque a se conditam communem et supremam populorum magistram reliquit. Homines enim, quos veritas liberaverat, veritate erant conservandi: neque diu permansissent caelestium doctrinarum fructus, per quos est homini parta salus, nisi Christus Dominus erudiendis ad fidem mentibus perenne magisterium constituisset. Ecclesia vero divini Auctoris sui cum erecta promissis, tum imitata caritatem, sic iussa perfecit, ut hoc semper spectarit, hoc maxime voluerit, de religione praecipere et cum erroribus perpetuo dimicare. Huc sane pertinent singulorum Episcoporum vigilati labores; huc Conciliorum perlatae leges ac decreta, et maxime Romanorum Pontificum sollicitudo quotidiana, penes quos, beati Petri Apostolorum Principis in primatu successores, et ius et officium est docendi et confirmandi fratres in fide.—Quoniam vero, Apostolo monente, *per philosophiam et inanem fallaciam*[2] Christifidelium mentes decipi solent, et fidei sinceritas in hominibus corrumpi, idcirco supremi Ecclesiae Pastores muneris sui perpetuo esse duxerunt etiam veri nominis scientiam totis viribus provehere, simulque singulari vigilantia providere, ut ad fidei catholicae normam ubique traderentur humanae disciplinae omnes, praesertim vero *philosophia,* a qua nimirum magna ex parte pendet ceterarum scientiarum recta ratio. Id ipsum et Nos inter cetera breviter monuimus, Venerabiles Fratres, cum primum Vos omnes per Litteras Encyclicas allocuti sumus; sed modo rei gravitate, et temporum conditione compellimur rursus Vobiscum agere de incunda philosophicorum studiorum ratione, quae et bono fidei apte respondeat, et ipsi humanarum scientiarum dignitati sit consentanea.

Si quis in acerbitatem nostrorum temporum animum intendat, earumque rerum rationem, quae publice et privatim geruntur, cogitatione complectatur, is profecto comperiet, fecundam malorum causam, cum eorum quae premunt, tum eorum quae pertimescimus, in eo consistere,

[1] Matt. xxviii. 19.

[2] Coloss. ii. 8.

quod prava de divinis humanisque rebus scita, e scholis philosophorum iampridem profecta, in omnes civitatis ordines irrepserint, communi plurimorum suffragio recepta. Cum enim insitum homini natura sit, ut in agendo rationem ducem sequatur, si quid intelligentia peccat, in id et voluntas facile labitur: atque ita contingit, ut pravitas opinionum, quarum est in intelligentia sedes, in humanas actiones influat, easque pervertat. Ex adverso, si sana mens hominum fuerit, et solidis verisque principiis firmiter insistat, tum vero in publicum privatumque commodum plurima beneficia progignet.—Equidem non tantam humanae philosophiae vim et auctoritatem tribuimus, ut cunctis omnino erroribus propulsandis, vel evellendis parem esse iudicemus: sicut enim, cum primum est religio christiana constituta, per admirabile fidei lumen *non persuasibilibus humanae sapientiae verbis* diffusum, *sed in ostensione spiritus et virtutis*,[1] orbi terrarum contigit ut primaevae dignitati restitueretur; ita etiam in praesens ab omnipotenti potissimum virtute et auxilio Dei expectandum est, ut mortalium mentes, sublatis errorum tenebris, resipiscant. Sed neque spernenda, neu posthabenda sunt naturalia adiumenta, quae divinae sapientiae beneficio, fortiter suaviterque omnia disponentis, hominum generi suppetunt; quibus in adiumentis rectum philosophiae usum constat esse praecipuum. Non enim frustra rationis lumen humanae menti Deus inseruit; et tantum abest, ut superaddita fidei lux intelligentiae virtutem extinguat aut imminuat, ut potius perficiat, auctisque viribus, habilem ad maiora reddat.—Igitur postulat ipsius divinae Providentiae ratio, ut in revocandis ad fidem et ad salutem populis etiam ab humana scientia praesidium quaeratur: quam industriam, probabilem ac sapientem, in more positam fuisse praeclarissimorum Ecclesiae Patrum, antiquitatis monumenta testantur. Illi scilicet neque paucas, neque tenues rationi partes dare consueverunt, quas omnes perbreviter complexus est magnus Augustinus, *huic scientiae tribuens . . . illud quo fides saluberrima . . . gignitur, nutritur, defenditur, roboratur.*[2]

Ac primo quidem philosophia, si rite a sapientibus usurpetur, iter ad veram fidem quodammodo sternere et munire valet, suorumque alumnorum animos ad revelationem suscipiendam convenienter praeparare: quamobrem a veteribus modo *praevia ad christianam fidem institutio*,[3] modo *christianismi praeludium et auxilium*,[4] modo *ad Evangelium paedagogus*[5] non immerito appellata est.

Et sane benignissimus Deus, in eo quod pertinet ad res divinas, non eas tantum veritates lumine fidei patefecit, quibus attingendis impar humana intelligentia est, sed nonnullas etiam manifestavit, rationi non omnino impervias, ut scilicet accedente Dei auctoritate, statim et sine aliqua erroris admixtione omnibus innotescerent. Ex quo factum est, ut quaedam vera, quae vel divinitus ad credendum proponuntur, vel cum doctrina fidei arctis quibusdam vinculis colligantur, ipsi ethnicorum sapientes, naturali tantum ratione praelucente, cognoverint, aptisque argumentis demonstraverint ac vindicaverint. *Invisibilia enim ipsius*, ut Apostolus inquit, *a creatura mundi per ea, quae facta sunt, intellecta conspiciuntur, sempiterna quoque eius virtus et divinitas*;[6] et *gentes quae legem non habent . . . ostendunt* nihilominus *opus legis scriptum in cordibus suis*.[7] Haec autem vera, vel ipsis ethnicorum sapientibus explorata, vehementer est opportunum in revelatae doctrinae commodum

---

[1] 1 Cor. ii. 4.
[2] De Trin. lib. xiv. c. 1.
[3] Clem. Alex., Strom. lib. i. c. 16; l. vii. c. 3.
[4] Orig. ad Greg. Thaum.
[5] Clem. Alex., Strom. i. c. 5.
[6] Rom. i. 20.
[7] Ib. ii. 14, 15.

utilitatemque convertere, ut reipsa ostendatur, humanam quoque sapientiam, atque ipsum adversariorum testimonium fidei christianae suffragari. Quam agendi rationem, non recens introductam, sed veterem esse constat, et sanctis Ecclesiae Patribus saepe usitatam. Quin etiam venerabiles isti religiosarum traditionum testes et custodes formam quamdam eius rei et prope figuram agnoscunt in Hebraeorum facto, qui Aegypto excessuri, deferre secum iussi sunt argentea atque aurea Aegyptiorum vasa cum vestibus pretiosis, ut scilicet, mutato repente usu, religioni veri Numinis ea supellex dedicaretur, quae prius ignominiosis ritibus et superstitioni inservierat. Gregorius Neocaesariensis[1] laudat Origenem hoc nomine, quod plura ex ethnicorum placitis ingeniose decerpta, quasi erepta hostibus tela, in patrocinium christianae sapientiae et perniciem superstitionis singulari dexteritate retorserit. Et parem disputandi morem cum Gregorius Nazianzenus,[2] tum Gregorius Nyssenus[3] in Basilio Magno et laudant et probant; Hieronymus vero magnopere commendat in Quadrato Apostolorum discipulo, in Aristide, in Iustino, in Irenaeo, aliisque permultis.[4] Augustinus autem. *Vonne aspicimus*, inquit, *quanto auro et argento et veste suffarcinatus exierit de Aegypto Cyprianus, doctor suavissimus et martyr beatissimus? quanto Lactantius? quanto Victorinus, Optatus, Hilarius? ut de vivis taceam, quanto innumerabiles Graeci?*[5] Quod si vero naturalis ratio opimam hanc doctrinae segetem prius fudit, quam Christi virtute fecundaretur, multo uberiorem certe progignet, posteaquam Salvatoris gratia nativas humanae mentis facultates instauravit et auxit.—Ecquis autem non videat, iter planum et facile per huiusmodi philosophandi genus ad fidem aperiri?

Non his tamen limitibus utilitas circumscribitur, quae ex illo philosophandi instituto dimanat. Et revera divinae sapientiae eloquiis graviter reprehenditur eorum hominum stultitia, qui *de his quae videntur bona, non potuerunt intelligere Eum qui est; neque, operibus attendentes, agnoverunt quis esset artifex.*[6] Igitur primo loco magnus hic et praeclarus ex humana ratione fructus capitur, quod illa Deum esse demonstret: *a magnitudine enim speciei et creaturae cognoscibiliter poterit Creator horum videri.*[7]—Deinde Deum ostendit omnium perfectionum cumulo singulariter excellere, infinita in primis sapientia, quam nulla usquam res latere, et summa iustitia, quam pravus nunquam vincere possit affectus, ideoque Deum non solum veracem esse, sed ipsam etiam veritatem falli et fellere nesciam. Ex quo consequi perspicuum est, ut humana ratio plenissimam verbo Dei fidem atque auctoritatem conciliet.—Simili modo ratio declarat, evangelicam doctrinam mirabilibus quibusdam signis, tamquam certis certae veritatis argumentis, vel ab ipsa origine emicuisse: atque ideo omnes, qui Evangelio fidem adiungunt, non temere adiungere, tamquam doctas fabulas secutos,[8] sed rationabili prorsus obsequio intelligentiam et iudicium suum divinae subiicere auctoritati. Illud autem non minoris pretii esse intelligitur, quod ratio in perspicuo ponat, Ecclesiam a Christo institutam (ut statuit Vaticana Synodus) *ob suam admirabilem propagationem, eximiam sanctitatem et inexhaustam in omnibus locis fecunditatem, ob catholicam unitatem, invictamque stabilitatem, magnum quoddam et perpetuum esse motivum credibilitatis, et divinae suae legationis testimonium irrefragabile.*[9]

Solidissimis ita positis fundamentis, perpetuus et multiplex adhuc

---

[1] Orat. paneg. ad Origen.
[2] Vit. Moys.
[3] Carm. i. Iamb. 3.
[4] Epist. ad Magn.
[5] De doctr. christ. l. ii. c. 40.
[6] Sap. xiii. 1.
[7] Sap. xiii. 5.
[8] 2 Petr. i. 16.
[9] Const. dogm. de Fid. Cath., cap. 3.

requiritur philosophiae usus, ut sacra Theologia naturam, habitum, ingeniumque verae scientiae suscipiat atque induat. In hac enim nobilissima disciplinarum magnopere necesse est, ut multae ac diversae caelestium doctrinarum partes in unum veluti corpus colligantur, ut suis quaeque locis convenienter dispositae, et ex propriis principiis derivatae apto inter se nexu cohaereant; demum ut omnes et singulae suis iisque invictis argumentis confirmentur.—Nec silentio praetereunda, aut minimi facienda est accuratior illa atque uberior rerum, quae creduntur, cognitio, et ipsorum fidei mysteriorum, quoad fieri potest, aliquanto lucidior intelligentia, quam Augustinus aliique Patres et laudarunt et assequi studuerunt, quamque ipsa Vaticana Synodus[1] fructuosissimam esse decrevit. Eam siquidem cognitionem et intelligentiam plenius et facilius certe illi consequuntur, qui cum integritate vitae fideique studio ingenium coniungunt philosophicis disciplinis expolitum, praesertim cum eadem Synodus Vaticana doceat, eiusmodi sacrorum dogmatum intelligentiam *tum ex eorum, quae naturaliter cognoscuntur, analogia; tum e mysteriorum ipsorum nexu inter se et cum fine hominis ultimo* peti oportere.[2]

Postremo hoc quoque ad disciplinas philosophicas pertinet, veritates divinitus traditas religiose tueri, et iis qui oppugnare audeant resistere. Quam ad rem, magna est philosophiae laus, quod fidei propugnaculum ac veluti firmum religionis munimentum habeatur. *Est quidem*, sicut Clemens Alexandrinus testatur, *per se perfecta et nullius indiga Servatoris doctrina, cum sit Dei virtus et sapientia. Accedens autem graeca philosophia veritatem non facit potentiorem; sed cum debiles efficiat sophistarum adversus eam argumentationes, et propulset dolosos adversus veritatem insidias, dicta est vineae apta sepes et vallus.*[3] Profecto sicut inimici catholici nominis, adversus religionem pugnaturi, bellicos apparatus plerumque a philosophica ratione mutuantur, ita divinarum scientiarum defensores plura e philosophiae penu depromunt, quibus revelata dogmata valeant propugnare. Neque mediocriter in eo triumphare fides christiana censenda est, quod adversariorum arma, humanae rationis artibus ad nocendum comparata, humana ipsa ratio potenter expediteque repellat. Quam speciem religiosi certaminis ab ipso gentium Apostolo usurpatam commemorat S. Hieronymus scribens ad Magnum: *Ductor christiani exercitus Paulus et orator invictus, pro Christo causam agens, etiam inscriptionem fortuitam arte torquet in argumentum fidei didicerat enim a vero David extorquere de manibus hostium gladium, et Goliath superbissimi caput proprio mucrone truncare.*[4] Atque ipsa Ecclesia istud a philosophia praesidium christianos doctores petere non tantum suadet, sed etiam iubet. Etenim Concilium Lateranense V. posteaquam constituit, *omnem assertionem veritati illuminatae fidei contrariam omnino falsam esse, eo quod verum vero minime contradicat*,[5] philosophiae doctoribus praecipit, ut in dolosis argumentis dissolvendis studiose versentur; siquidem, ut Augustinus testatur, *si ratio contra divinarum Scripturarum auctoritatem redditur, quamlibet acuta sit, fallit veri similitudine; nam vera esse non potest.*[6]

Verum ut pretiosis hisce, quos memoravimus, afferendis fructibus par philosophia inveniatur, omnino oportet, ut ab eo tramite numquam deflectat, quem et veneranda Patrum antiquitas ingressa est, et Vaticana Synodus solemni auctoritatis suffragio comprobavit. Scilicet cum plane compertum sit, plurimas ex ordine supernaturali veritates esse accipiendas, quae cuiuslibet ingenii longe vincunt acumen, ratio humana, pro-

---

[1] Const. cit., cap. 4. [2] Ibid. [3] Strom. lib. i. c. 20.
[4] Epist. ad Magn. [5] Bulla Apostolici regiminis.
[6] Epist. 143 (al. 7), ad Marcellin. n. 7.

priae infirmitatis conscia, maiora se affectare ne audeat, neque easdem veritates negare, neve propria virtute metiri, neu pro lubitu interpretari ; sed eas potius plena atque humili fide suscipiat, et summi honoris loco habeat, quod sibi liceat, in morem ancillae et pedisequae, famulari caelestibus doctrinis, easque aliqua ratione, Dei beneficio, attingere. In iis autem doctrinarum capitibus, quae percipere humana intelligentia naturaliter potest, aequum plane est, sua methodo, suisque principiis et argumentis uti philosophiam : non ita tamen, ut auctoritati divinae sese audacter subtrahere videatur. Imo, cum constet, ea quae revelatione innotescunt, certa veritate pollere, et quae fidei adversantur pariter cum recta ratione pugnare, noverit philosophus catholicus se fidei simul et rationis iura violaturum, si conclusionem aliquam amplectatur, quam revelatae doctrinae repugnare intellexerit.

Novimus profecto non deesse, qui facultates humanae naturae plus nimio extollentes, contendunt, hominis intelligentiam, ubi semel divinae auctoritati subiiciatur, e nativa dignitate excidere, et quodam quasi servitutis iugo demissam plurimum retardari atque impediri, quominus ad veritatis excellentiaeque fastigium progrediatur.—Sed haec plena erroris et fallaciae sunt ; eoque tandem spectant, ut homines, summa cum stultitia, nec sine crimine ingrati animi, sublimiores veritates repudient, et divinum beneficium fidei, ex qua omnium bonorum fontes etiam in civilem societatem fluxere, sponte reiiciant. Etenim cum humana mens certis finibus, iisque satis angustis, conclusa teneatur, pluribus erroribus, et multarum rerum ignorationi est obnoxia. Contra fides christiana, cum Dei auctoritate nitatur, certissima est veritatis magistra ; quam qui sequitur, neque errorum laqueis irretitur, neque incertarum opinionum fluctibus agitatur. Quapropter qui philosophiae studium cum obsequio fidei christianae coniungunt, ii optime philosophantur : quandoquidem divinarum veritatum splendor, animo exceptus, ipsam iuvat intelligentiam : cui non modo nihil de dignitate detrahit, sed nobilitatis, acuminis, firmitatis plurimum addit.—Cum vero ingenii aciem intendunt in refellendis sententiis, quae fidei repugnant, et in probandis, quae cum fide cohaerent, digne ac perutiliter rationem exercent : in illis enim prioribus, causas erroris deprehendunt, et argumentorum, quibus ipsae fulciuntur, vitium dignoscunt : in his autem posterioribus, rationum momentis potiuntur, quibus solide demonstrentur et cuilibet prudenti persuadeantur. Hac vero industria et exercitatione augeri mentis opes et explicari facultates qui neget, ille veri falsique discrimen nihil conducere ad profectum ingenii, absurde contendat necesse est. Merito igitur Vaticana Synodus praeclara beneficia, quae per fidem rationi praestantur, his verbis commemorat : *Fides rationem ab erroribus liberat ac tuetur, eamque multiplici cognitione instruit.*[1] Atque idcirco homini, si saperet, non culpanda fides, veluti rationi et naturalibus veritatibus inimica, sed dignae potius Deo grates essent habendae, vehementerque laetandum, quod, inter multas ignorantiae causas et in mediis errorum fluctibus, sibi fides sanctissima illuxerit, quae, quasi sidus amicum, citra omnem errandi formidinem portum veritatis commonstrat.

Quod si, Venerabiles Fratres, ad historiam philosophiae respiciatis, cuncta, quae paullo ante diximus, re ipsa comprobari intelligetis. Et sane philosophorum veterum, qui fidei beneficio caruerunt, etiam qui habebantur sapientissimi, in pluribus deterrime errarunt. Nostis enim, inter nonnulla vera, quam saepe falsa et absona, quam multa incerta et dubia tradiderint de vera divinitatis ratione, de prima rerum origine, de mundi gubernatione, de divina futurorum cognitione, de malorum

[1] Const. dogm. de Fid. Cath., cap. 4.

causa et principio, de ultimo fine hominis, aeternaque beatitudine, de virtutibus et vitiis, aliisque doctrinis, quarum vera certaque notitia nihil magis est hominum generi necessarium.—Contra vero primi Ecclesiae Patres et Doctores, qui satis intellexerant, ex divinae voluntatis consilio, restitutorem humanae etiam scientiae esse Christum, qui Dei virtus est Deique sapientia,[1] et *in quo sunt omnes thesauri sapientiae et scientiae absconditi*,[2] veterum sapientum libros investigandos, eorumque sententias cum revelatis doctrinis conferendas suscepere: prudentique delectu quae in illis vere dicta et sapienter cogitata occurrerent, amplexi sunt, ceteris omnibus vel emendatis, vel reiectis. Nam providissimus Deus, sicut ad Ecclesiae defensionem martyres fortissimos, magnae animae prodigos, contra tyrannorum saevitiem excitavit, ita philosophis falsi nominis aut haereticis viros sapientia maximos obiecit, qui revelatarum veritatum thesaurum etiam rationis humanae praesidio tuerentur. Itaque ab ipsis Ecclesiae primordiis, catholica doctrina eos nacta est adversarios multo infensissimos, qui christianorum dogmata et instituta irridentes, ponebant plures esse deos, mundi materiam principio causaque caruisse, rerumque cursum caeca quadam vi et fatali contineri necessitate, non divinae providentiae consilio administrari. Iamvero cum his insanientis doctrinae magistris mature congressi sunt sapientes viri, quos *Apologetas* nominamus, qui, fide praeeunte, ab humana quoque sapientia argumenta sumpserunt, quibus constituerent, unum Deum, omni perfectionum genere praestantissimum esse colendum; res omnes e nihilo omnipotenti virtute productas, illius sapientia vigere, singulasque ad proprios fines dirigi ac moveri.—Principem inter illos sibi locum vindicat *S. Iustinus* martyr, qui posteaquam celeberrimas graecorum Academias, quasi experiendo, lustrasset, plenoque ore nonnisi ex revelatis doctrinis, ut idem ipse fatetur, veritatem hauriri posse pervidisset, illas toto animi ardore complexus, calumniis purgavit, penes Romanorum Imperatores acriter copioseque defendit, et non pauca graecorum philosophorum dicta cum eis composuit. Quod et *Quadratus*, et *Aristides*, *Hermias* et *Athenagoras* per illud tempus egregie praestiterunt.—Neque minorem in eadem causa gloriam adeptus est *Irenaeus*, martyr invictus, Ecclesiae Lugdunensis Pontifex: qui cum strenue refutaret perversas orientalium opiniones, Gnosticorum opera per fines Romani imperii disseminatas, *origines haereseon singularum* (auctore Hieronymo), *et ex quibus philosophorum fontibus emanarint . . . explicavit*.[3]—Nemo autem non novit *Clementis Alexandrini* disputationes, quas idem Hieronymus sic, honoris causa, commemorat; *Quid in illis indoctum? imo quid non de media philosophia est?*[4] Multa ipse quidem incredibili varietate disseruit ad condendam philosophiae historiam, ad artem dialecticam rite exercendam, ad concordiam rationis cum fide conciliandam utilissima.—Hunc secutus *Origenes*, scholae Alexandrinae magisterio insignis, graecorum et orientalium doctrinis eruditissimus, perplura eademque laboriosa edidit volumina, divinis litteris explanandis, sacrisque dogmatibus illustrandis mirabiliter opportuna; quae licet erroribus, saltem ut nunc extant, omnino non vacent, magnam tamen complectuntur vim sententiarum, quibus naturales veritates et numero et firmitate augentur.—Pugnat cum haereticis *Tertullianus* auctoritate sacrarum Litterarum; cum philosophis, mutato armorum genere, philosophice; hos autem tam acute et erudite convincit, ut iisdem palam fidenterque obiiciat: *Neque de scientia, neque de disciplina, ut putatis, aequamur*.[5]—*Arnobius* etiam, vulgatis adversus gentiles libris, et *Lactantius* divinis praesertim Institutionibus, pari eloquentia

---

[1] 1. Cor. i. 24. [2] Coloss. ii. 3. [3] Epist. ad Magn.
[4] Loc. cit. [5] Apologet. § 46.

et robore dogmata ac praecepta catholicae sapientiae persuadere hominibus strenue nituntur, non sic philosophiam evertentes, ut Academici solent,[1] sed partim suis armis, partim vero ex philosophorum inter se concertatione sumptis eos revincentes.[2]—Quae autem de anima humana, de divinis attributis, aliisque maximi momenti quaestionibus, magnus *Athanasius* et *Chrysostomus* oratorum princeps, scripta reliquerunt, ita, omnium iudicio, excellunt, ut prope nihil ad illorum subtilitatem et copiam addi posse videatur.—Et ne singulis recensendis nimii simus, summorum numero virorum, quorum est mentio facta, adiungimus *Basilium* magnum et utrumque *Gregorium*, qui, cum Athenis, ex domicilio totius humanitatis, exiissent philosophiae omnis apparatu affatim instructi, quas sibi quisque doctrinae opes inflammato studio pepererat, eas ad haereticos refutandos, instituendosque christianos converterunt.—Sed omnibus veluti palmam praeripuisse visus est *Augustinus*, qui ingenio praepotens, et sacris profanisque disciplinis ad plenum imbutus, contra omnes suae aetatis errores acerrime dimicavit fide summa, doctrina pari. Quem ille philosophiae locum non attigit; imo vero quem non diligentissime investigavit, sive cum altissima fidei mysteria et fidelibus aperiret, et contra adversariorum vesanos impetus defenderet; sive cum, Academicorum aut Manichaeorum commentis deletis, humanae scientiae fundamenta et firmitudinem in tuto collocavit, aut malorum, quibus premuntur homines, rationem et originem et causas est persecutus? Quanta de Angelis, de anima, de mente humana, de voluntate et libero arbitrio, de religione et de beata vita, de tempore et aeternitate, de ipsa quoque mutabilium corporum natura subtilissime disputavit?—Post id tempus per Orientem *Ioannes Damascenus*, Basilii et Gregorii Nazianzeni vestigia ingressus, per Occidentem vero *Boëtius* et *Anselmus*, Augustini doctrinas professi, patrimonium philosophiae plurimum locupletarunt.

Exinde mediae aetatis Doctores, quos *Scholasticos* vocant, magnae molis opus aggressi sunt, nimirum segetes doctrinae fecundas et uberes, amplissimis Sanctorum Patrum voluminibus diffusas, diligenter congerere, congestasque uno velut loco condere, in posterorum usum et commoditatem,—Quae autem scholasticae disciplinae sit origo, indoles et excellentia, iuvat hic, Venerabiles Fratres, verbis sapientissimi viri, Praedecessoris Nostri, Sixti V. fusius aperire: "Divino Illius munere, "qui solus dat spiritum scientiae et sapientiae et intellectus, quique "Ecclesiam suam per saeculorum aetates, prout opus est, novis bene-"ficiis auget, novis praesidiis instruit, inventa est a maioribus nos-"tris sapientissimis viris, Theologia scholastica, quam duo potissimum "gloriosi Doctores, angelicus S. Thomas et seraphicus S. Bonaventura, "clarissimi huius facultatis professores, . . . excellenti ingenio, assiduo "studio, magnis laboribus et vigiliis excoluerunt atque ornarunt, eamque "optime dispositam, multisque modis praeclare explicatam posteris tra-"diderunt. Et huius quidem tam salutaris scientiae cognitio et exerci-"tatio, quae ab uberrimis divinarum Litterarum, summorum Pontificum, "sanctorum Patrum et Conciliorum fontibus dimanat, semper certe "maximum Ecclesiae adiumentum afferre potuit, sive ad Scripturas ipsas "vere et sane intelligendas et interpretandas, sive ad Patres securius et "utilius perlegendos et explicandos, sive ad varios errores et haereses "detegendas et refellendas: his vero novissimis diebus, quibus iam ad-"venerunt tempora illa periculosa ab Apostolo descripta, et homines "blasphemi, superbi, seductores proficiunt in peius, errantes et alios in "errorem mittentes, sane catholicae fidei dogmatibus confirmandis et "haeresibus confutandis pernecessaria est."[3] Quae verba quamvis Theo-

[1] Inst. vii. cap. 7. [2] De opif. Dei, cap. 21. [3] Bulla Triumphantis, an. 1588.

logiam scholasticam dumtaxat complecti videantur, tamen esse quoque de Philosophia eiusque laudibus accipienda perspicitur. Siquidem praeclarae dotes, quae Theologiam scholasticam hostibus veritatis faciunt tantopere formidolosam, nimirum, ut idem Pontifex addit, "apta illa et "inter se nexa rerum et causarum cohaerentia, ille ordo et dispositio "tamquam militum in pugnando instructio, illae dilucidae definitiones "et distinctiones, illa argumentorum firmitas et acutissimae disputationes, "quibus lux a tenebris, verum a falso distinguitur, haereticorum mendacia "multis praestigiis et fallaciis involuta, tamquam veste detracta, pate-"fiunt et denudantur,"[1] praeclarae, inquimus, et mirabiles istae dotes unice a recto usu repetendae sunt eius philosophiae, quam magistri scholastici, data opera et sapienti consilio, in disputationibus etiam theologicis, passim usurpare consueverunt.—Praeterea cum illud sit scholasticorum Theologorum proprium ac singulare, ut scientiam humanam ac divinam arctissimo inter se vinculo coniunxerint, profecto Theologia, in qua illi excelluerunt, non erat tantum honoris et commendationis ab opinione hominum adeptura, si mancam atque imperfectam aut levem philosophiam adhibuissent.

Iamvero inter Scholasticos Doctores, omnium princeps et magister, longe eminet *Thomas Aquinas;* qui, uti Caietanus animadvertit, veteres *doctores sacros quia summe veneratus est, ideo intellectum omnium quodammodo sortitus est.*[2] Illorum doctrinas, velut dispersa cuiusdam corporis membra, in unum Thomas collegit et coagmentavit, miro ordine digessit, et magnis incrementis ita adauxit, ut catholicae Ecclesiae singulare praesidium et decus iure meritoque habeatur.—Ille quidem ingenio docilis et acer, memoria facilis et tenax, vitae integerrimus, veritatis unice amator, divina humanaque scientia praedives, Soli comparatus, orbem terrarum calore virtutum fovit, et doctrinae splendore complevit. Nulla est philosophiae pars, quam non acute simul et solide pertractarit: de legibus ratiocinandi, de Deo et incorporeis substantiis, de homine aliisque sensibilibus rebus, de humanis actibus eorumque principiis ita disputavit, ut in eo neque copiosa quaestionum seges, neque apta partium dispositio, neque optima procedendi ratio, neque principiorum firmitas aut argumentorum robur, neque dicendi perspicuitas aut proprietas, neque abstrusa quaeque explicandi facilitas desideretur.

Illud etiam accedit, quod philosophicas conclusiones angelicus Doctor speculatus est in rerum rationibus et principiis, quae quam latissime patent, et infinitarum fere veritatum semina suo velut gremio concludunt, a posterioribus magistris opportuno tempore et uberrimo cum fructu aperienda. Quam philosophandi rationem cum in erroribus refutandis pariter adhibuerit, illud a se ipse impetravit, ut et superiorum temporum errores omnes unus debellarit, et ad profligandos, qui perpetua vice in posterum exorituri sunt, arma invictissima suppeditarit.—Praeterea rationem, ut par est, a fide apprime distinguens, utramque tamen amice consocians, utriusque tum iura conservavit, tum dignitati consuluit, ita quidem ut ratio ad humanum fastigium Thomae pennis evecta, iam fere nequeat sublimius assurgere; neque fides a ratione fere possit plura aut validiora adiumenta praestolari, quam quae iam est per Thomam consecuta.

Has ob causas, doctissimi homines, superioribus praesertim aetatibus, theologiae et philosophiae laude praestantissimi, con[illegible] studio Thomae voluminibus immortalibus, angelicae [illegible] non tam excolendos, quam penitus innutriendos tra[illegible] prope conditores et legiferos Ordinum religiosorum [illegible]

[1] Bull. cit.

[2] In 2.^{m} 2.^{ae}, q. 148, a. 4. in m.

dales suos, doctrinis S. Thomae studere et religiosius haerere, cauto, ne cui eorum impune liceat a vestigiis tanti viri vel minimum discedere. Ut Dominicanam familiam praetereamus, quae summo hoc magistro iure quodam suo gloriatur, ea lege teneri Benedictinos, Carmelitas, Augustinianos, Societatem Iesu, aliosque sacros Ordines complures, statuta singulorum testantur.

Atque hoc loco magna cum voluptate provolat animus ad celeberrimas illas, quae olim in Europa floruerunt, Academias et Scholas, Parisiensem nempe, Salmantinam, Complutensem, Duacenam, Tolosanam, Lovaniensem, Patavinam, Bononiensem, Neapolitanam, Conimbricensem, aliasque permultas. Quarum Academiarum nomen aetate quodammodo crevisse, rogatasque sententias, cum graviora agerentur negotia, plurimum in omnes partes valuisse, nemo ignorat. Iamvero compertum est, in magnis illis humanae sapientiae domiciliis, tamquam in suo regno, Thomam consedisse principem; atque omnium vel doctorum vel auditorum animos miro consensu in unius angelici Doctoris magisterio et auctoritate conquievisse.

Sed, quod pluris est, Romani Pontifices Praedecessores Nostri sapientiam Thomae Aquinatis singularibus laudum praeconiis, et testimoniis amplissimis prosecuti sunt. Nam Clemens VI.,[1] Nicolaus V.,[2] Benedictus XIII.[3] aliique testantur, admirabili eius doctrina universam Ecclesiam illustrari; S. Pius V.[4] vero fatetur eadem doctrina haereses confusas et convictas dissipari, orbemque universum a pestiferis quotide liberari erroribus; alii cum Clemente XII.,[5] uberrima bona ab eius scriptis in Ecclesiam universam dimanasse, Ipsumque eodem honore colendum esse affirmant, qui summis Ecclesiae doctoribus, Gregorio, Ambrosio, Augustino et Hieronymo defertur; alii tandem S. Thomam proponere non dubitarunt Academiis et magnis Lyceis exemplar et magistrum, quem tuto pede sequerentur. Qua in re memoratu dignissima videntur B. Urbani V. verba ad Academiam Tolosanam: *Volumus et tenore praesentium vobis iniungimus, ut B. Thomae doctrinam tamquam veridicam et catholicam sectemini, eamdemque studeatis totis viribus ampliare.*[6] Urbani autem exemplum Innocentius XII.[7] in Lovaniensi studiorum Universitate, et Benedictus XIV.[8] in Collegio Dyonysiano Granatensium renovarunt.—His vero Pontificum maximorum de Thoma Aquinate iudiciis, veluti cumulus, Innocentii VI. testimonium accedat: *Huius* (Thomae), *doctrina prae ceteris, excepta canonica, habet proprietatem verborum, modum dicendorum, veritatem sententiarum, ita ut numquam qui eam tenuerint, inveniantur a veritatis tramite deviasse; et qui eam impugnaverit, semper fuerit de veritate suspectus.*[9]

Ipsa quoque Concilia Oecumenica, in quibus eminet lectus ex toto orbe terrarum flos sapientiae, singularem Thomae Aquinati honorem habere perpetuo studuerunt. In Conciliis Lugdunensi, Viennensi, Florentino, Vaticano, deliberationibus et decretis Patrum interfuisse Thomam et pene praefuisse dixeris, adversus errores Graecorum, haereticorum et rationalistarum ineluctabili vi et faustissimo exitu decertantem.—Sed haec maxima est et Thomae propria, nec cum quopiam ex doctoribus catholicis communicata laus, quod Patres Tridentini, in ipso medio conclavi ordini habendo, una cum divinae Scripturae codicibus et Pontificum Maximorum decretis *Summam* Thomae Aquinatis super altari patere voluerunt, unde consilium, rationes, oracula peterentur.

---

[1] Bulla In Ordine.
[2] Breve ad FF. Ord. Praedic. 1451.
[3] Bulla Pretiosus.
[4] Bulla Mirabilis.
[5] Bulla Verbo Dei.
[6] Const. 5.ª dat. die 3 Aug. 1386 ad Cancell. Univ. Tolos.
[7] Litt. in form. Brev., die 6 Febr. 1694.
[8] Litt. in form. Brev., die 21 Aug. 1752.
[9] Serm. de S. Thom.

Postremo haec quoque palma viro incomparabili reservata videbatur, ut ab ipsis catholici nominis adversariis obsequia, praeconia, admirationem extorqueret. Nam exploratum est, inter haereticarum factionum duces non defuisse, qui palam profiterentur, sublata semel e medio doctrina Thomae Aquinatis, se facile posse *cum omnibus* catholicis doctoribus *subire certamen et vincere, et Ecclesiam dissipare.*[1]—Inanis quidem spes, sed testimonium non inane.

His rebus et causis, Venerabiles Fratres, quoties respicimus ad bonitatem, vim praeclarasque utilitates eius disciplinae philosophicae, quam maiores nostri adamarunt, iudicamus temere esse commissum, ut eidem suus honos non semper, nec ubique permanserit: praesertim cum philosophiae, scholasticae et usum diuturnum et maximorum virorum iudicium, et, quod caput est, Ecclesiae suffragium favisse constaret. Atque in veteris doctrinae locum nova quaedam philosophiae ratio hac illac successit, unde non ii percepti sunt fructus optabiles ac salutares, quos Ecclesia et ipsa civilis societas maluissent. Adnitentibus enim Novatoribus saeculi XVI, placuit philosophari citra quempiam ad fidem respectum, petita dataque vicissim potestate quaelibet pro lubitu ingenique excogitandi. Qua ex re pronum fuit, genera philosophiae plus aequo multiplicari, sententiasque diversas atque inter se pugnantes oriri etiam de iis rebus, quae sunt in humanis cognitionibus praecipuae. A multitudine sententiarium ad haesitationes dubitationesque persaepe ventum est: a dubitationibus vero in errorem quam facile mentes hominum delabantur, nemo est qui non videat.—Hoc autem novitatis studium, cum homines imitatione trahantur, catholicorum quoque philosophorum animos visum est alicubi pervasisse: qui patrimonio antiquae sapientiae posthabito, nova moliri, quam vetera novis augere et perficere maluerunt, certe minus sapienti consilio, et non sine scientiarum detrimento. Etenim multiplex haec ratio doctrinae, cum in magistrorum singulorum auctoritate arbitrioque nitatur, mutabile habet fundamentum, eaque de causa non firmam atque stabilem neque robustam, sicut veterem illam, sed nutantem et levem facit philosophiam. Cui si forte contingat, hostium impetu ferendo vix parem aliquando inveniri, eius rei agnoscat in seipsa residere causam et culpam.—Quae cum dicimus, non eos profecto improbamus doctos homines atque solertes, qui industriam et eruditionem suam, ac novorum inventorum opes ad excolendam philosophiam afferunt: id enim probe intelligimus ad incrementa doctrinae pertinere. Sed magnopere cavendum est, ne in illa industria atque eruditione tota aut praecipua exercitatio versetur.—Et simili modo de sacra Theologia iudicetur; quam multiplici eruditionis adiumento iuvari atque illustrari quidem placet; sed omnino necesse est, gravi Scholasticorum more tractari, ut revelationis et rationis conjunctis in illa viribus, *invictum fidei propugnaculum*[2] esse perseveret.

Optimo itaque consilio cultores disciplinarum philosophicarum non pauci, cum ad instaurandam utiliter philosophiam novissime animum adiecerint, praeclaram Thomae Aquinatis doctrinam restituere, atque in pristinum decus vindicare studuerunt et student. Pari voluntate plures ex ordine Vestro, Venerabiles Fratres, eamdem alacriter viam esse ingressos, magna cum animi Nostri laetitia cognovimus. Quos cum laudamus vehementer, tum hortamur, ut in suscepto consilio permaneant: reliquos vero omnes ex Vobis singulatim monemus, nihil Nobis esse antiquius et optabilius, quam ut sapientiae rivos purissimos, ex angelico Doctore iugi et praedivite vena dimanantes, studiosae iuventuti large copioseque universi praebeatis.

---

[1] Beza–Bucerus.

[2] Sixtus V. Bull. cit.

Quae autem faciunt, ut magno id studio velimus, plura sunt.—Principo quidem, cum in hac tempestate nostra, machinationibus et astu fallacis cuiusdam sapientiae, christiana fides oppugnari soleat, cuncti adolescentes, sed ii nominatim qui in Ecclesiae spem succrescunt, pollenti ac robusto doctrinae pabulo ob eam causam enutriendi sunt, ut viribus validi, et copioso armorum apparatu instructi, mature assuescant causam religionis fortiter et sapienter agere, *parati semper* secundum Apostolica monita, *ad satisfactionem omni poscenti rationem de ea, quae in nobis est, spe*;[1] et *exhortari in doctrina sana, et eos qui contradicunt, arguere*.[2] Deinde plurimi ex iis hominibus qui, abalienato a fide animo, instituta catholica oderunt, solam sibi esse magistram ac ducem rationem profitentur. Ad hos autem sanandos, et in gratiam cum fide catholica restituendos, praeter supernaturale Dei auxilium, nihil esse opportunius arbitramur, quam solidam Patrum et Scholasticorum doctrinam, qui firmissima fidei fundamenta, divinam illius originem, certam veritatem, argumenta quibus suadetur, beneficia in humanum genus collata, perfectamque cum ratione concordiam tanta evidentia et vi commonstrant, quanta flectendis mentibus vel maxime invitis et repugnantibus abunde sufficiat.

Domestica vero, atque civilis ipsa societas, quae ob perversarum opinionum pestem quanto in discrimine versetur, universi perspicimus, profecto pacatior multo et securior consisteret, si in Academiis et scholis sanior traderetur, et magisterio Ecclesiae conformior doctrina, qualem Thomae Aquinatis volumina complectuntur. Quae enim de germana ratione libertatis, hoc tempore in licentiam abeuntis, de divina cuiuslibet auctoritatis origine, de legibus earumque vi, de paterno et aequo summorum Principum imperio, de obtemperatione sublimioribus potestatibus, de mutua inter omnes caritate ; quae scilicet de his rebus et aliis generis eiusdem a Thoma disputantur, maximum atque invictum robur habent ad evertenda ea iuris novi principia, quae pacato rerum ordini et publicae saluti periculosa esse dignoscuntur.—Demum cunctae humanae disciplinae spem incrementi praecipere, plurimumque sibi debent praesidium polliceri ab hac, quae Nobis est proposita, disciplinarum philosophicarum instauratione. Etenim a philosophia, tamquam a moderatrice sapientia, sanam rationem rectumque modum bonae artes mutuari, ab eaque, tamquam vitae communi fonte, spiritum haurire consueverunt. Facto et constanti experientia comprobatur, artes liberales tunc maxime floruisse, cum incolumis honor et sapiens iudicium philosophiae stetit ; neglectas vero et prope obliteratas iacuisse, inclinata atque erroribus vel ineptiis implicita philosophia.—Quapropter etiam physicae disciplinae, quae nunc tanto sunt in pretio, et tot praeclare inventis, singularem ubique cient admirationem sui, ex restituta veterum philosophia non modo nihil detrimenti, sed plurimum praesidii sunt habiturae. Illarum enim fructuosae exercitationi et incremento non sola satis est consideratio factorum, contemplatioque naturae ; sed, cum facta constiterint, altius assurgendum est, et danda solerter opera naturis rerum corporearum agnoscendis, investigandisque legibus, quibus parent, et principiis, unde ordo illarum, et unitas in varietate, et mutua affinitas in diversitate proficiscuntur. Quibus investigationibus mirum quantam philosophia scholastica vim et lucem, et opem est allatura, si sapienti ratione tradatur.

Qua in re et illud monere iuvat, nonnisi per summam iniuriam eidem philosophiae vitio verti, quod naturalium scientiarum profectui et incremento adversetur. Cum enim Scholastici, sanctorum Patrum sententiam secuti, in Anthropologia passim tradiderint, humanam intelligentiam

---

[1] 2 Pet. III. 15. [2] Tit. I. 9.

nonnisi ex rebus sensibilibus ad noscendas res corpore materiaque carentes evehi, sponte sua intellexerunt, nihil esse philosopho utilius, quam naturae arcana diligenter investigare, et in rerum physicarum studio diu multumque versari. Quod et facto suo confirmarunt: nam S. Thomas, B. Albertus magnus, aliique Scholasticorum principes, non ita se contemplationi philosophiae dediderunt, ut non etiam multum operae in naturalium rerum cognitione collocarint: imo non pauca sunt in hoc genere dicta eorum et scita, quae recentes magistri probent, et cum veritate congruere fateantur. Praeterea, hac ipsa aetate, plures iique insignes scientiarum physicarum doctores palam aperteque testantur, inter certas ratasque recentioris Physicae conclusiones, et philosophica Scholae principia nullam veri nominis pugnam existere.

Nos igitur, dum edicimus libenti gratoque animo excipiendum esse quidquid sapienter dictum, quidquid utiliter fuerit a quopiam inventum atque excogitatum; Vos omnes, Venerabiles Fratres, quam enixe hortamur, ut ad catholicae fidei tutelam et decus, ad societatis bonum, ad scientiarum omnium incrementum auream sancti Thomae sapientiam restituatis, et quam latissime propagetis. Sapientiam sancti Thomae dicimus: si quid enim est a doctoribus Scholasticis vel nimia subtilitate quaesitum, vel parum considerate traditum, si quid cum exploratis posterioris aevi doctrinis minus cohaerens, vel denique quoquo modo non probabile, id nullo pacto in animo est aetati nostrae ad imitandum proponi.—Ceterum, doctrinam Thomae Aquinatis studeant magistri, a Vobis intelligenter lecti, in discipulorum animos insinuare; eiusque prae ceteris soliditatem atque excellentiam in perspicuo ponant. Eamdem Academiae a Vobis institutae aut instituendae illustrent ac tueantur, et ad grassantium errorum refutationem adhibeant.—Ne autem supposita pro vera, neu corrupta pro sincera bibatur, providete ut sapientia Thomae ex ipsis eius fontibus hauriatur, aut saltem ex iis rivis, quos ab ipso fonte deductos, adhuc integros et illimes decurrere certa et concors doctorum hominum sententia est: sed ab iis, qui exinde fluxisse dicuntur, re autem alienis et non salubribus aquis creverunt, adolescentium animos arcendos curate.

Probe autem novimus conatus Nostros irritos futuros, nisi communia cepta, Venerabiles Fratres, Ille secundet, qui *Deus scientiarum* in divinis eloquiis[1] appellatur; quibus etiam monemur, *omne datum optimum et omne donum perfectum desursum* esse, *descendens a Patre luminum.*[2] Et rursus: *Si quis indiget sapientia, postulet a Deo, qui dat omnibus affluenter, et non improperat; et dabitur ei.*[3]—Igitur hac quoque in re exempla sequamur Doctoris angelici, qui numquam se lectioni aut scriptioni dedit, nisi propitiato precibus Deo; quique candide confessus est, quidquid sciret, non tam se studio aut labore suo sibi peperisse, quam divinitus accepisse: ideoque humili et concordi obsecratione Deum simul omnes exoremus, ut in Ecclesiae filios spiritum scientiae et intellectus emittat, et aperiat eis sensum ad intelligendam sapientiam. Atque ad uberiores percipiendos divinae bonitatis fructus, etiam B. Virginis Mariae, quae sedes sapientiae appellatur, efficacissimum patrocinium apud Deum interponite; simulque deprecatores adhibete purissimum Virginis Sponsum B. Iosephum, et Petrum ac Paullum Apostolos maximos, qui orbem terrarum, impura errorum lue corruptum, veritate renovarunt, et caelestis sapientiae lumine compleverunt.

Denique divini auxilii spe freti, et pastorali Vestro studio confisi, Apostolicam benedictionem, caelestium munerum auspicem et singularis

---

[1] 1. Reg. ii. 3. [2] Iac. i. 17. [3] Ibid. v. 5.

Nostrae benevolentiae testem, Vobis omnibus, Venerabiles Fratres, universoque Klero et populo singulis commisso, peramanter in Domino impertimur.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, die 4 Augusti an. 1879, Pontificatus Nostri anno Secundo.

LEO PP. XIII.

[TRANSLATION.]

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF OUR MOST HOLY LORD.

LEO XIII.,

BY DIVINE PROVIDENCE POPE,

To all the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, and Bishops of the Catholic world holding grace and communion with the Apostolic See.

To our Venerable Brethren all the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, and Bishops, of the Catholic world, in grace and communion with the Apostolic See,

LEO XIII.

Venerable Brethren: Health and Apostolic Benediction.

THE only begotten Son of the Eternal Father, who appeared on earth that he might bring salvation and the light of divine wisdom to the human race, conferred a great and wonderful benefit on the world, when, on the point of ascending again to heaven, He commanded the Apostles that *going forth they should teach all nations*,[1] and left the Church founded by Himself the common and supreme teacher of the peoples. For men, whom the truth had made free, were to be preserved by the truth, nor would the fruits of the heavenly doctrines, whereby mankind was to obtain salvation, have long remained, if Christ our Lord had not established a teaching authority, that was to last forever, to train the minds of men to faith. And the Church, strengthened by the promises of her Divine Author, and taking for her pattern His charity, has executed His commands so perfectly, that this alone has always been her aim, this her all-absorbing wish, to teach religion and to fight continually with error. To this end are certainly directed the sleepless labors of all the bishops; to this end the sanctioned laws and decrees of the Councils, and especially the constant solicitude of the Roman Pontiffs, with whom, as the successors in the primacy of the Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, rests both the right and the duty of teaching and confirming the brethren in the faith. But since, as the Apostle gives warning, *through philosophy and vain deceit*[2] the minds of the faithful are wont to be deceived, and the sincerity of faith corrupted among men, therefore the Supreme Pastors of the Church deemed it their incessant duty likewise to promote with all their energies science in its truest acceptation, and, at the same time, with special vigilance, to provide that all branches of human knowledge, and especially *philosophy*, upon which the proper condition of the other sciences in a great measure depends, should be imparted everywhere according to the rule of the Catholic faith. And we ourselves did admonish you briefly among other things

[1] Matt. xxviii. 19.

[2] Coloss. ii. 8.

of this very matter, Venerable Brethren, when we first addressed you through our Encyclical Letters; but now, owing to the importance of the subject and the condition of the times, we are again compelled to treat with you on establishing a method of philosophical studies which shall be suitable and advantageous to faith, and at the same time not unsuited to the dignity of human science.

If any one will but turn his attention to the sad condition of our times, and contemplate thoughtfully the state of things which exists publicly and privately, he will surely perceive that the fertile cause of the evils which actually surround us, or of which we fear the coming, consists in this, that the wicked maxims on divine and human things which have recently sprung from the schools of the philosophers have invaded all classes of the commonwealth, and are approved of by a very great number. For as it is natural to man to follow reason as the guide of his actions, so if the intelligence fall into error, the will easily follows, too, and thus it comes to pass that bad opinions, whose seat is the intelligence, influence human actions and pervert them. On the contrary, if the mind of men be sound, and rest firmly upon solid and true principles, then, indeed, will it bring forth many benefits both for the public and private good. Certainly, we do not attribute such force and authority to human philosophy as to judge it capable of rejecting or eradicating all errors: for as when the Christian religion was first established, through the admirable light of faith diffused, "not by the persuasive words of human wisdom, but in the showing forth of the spirit and of power,"[1] the world was restored to its primeval dignity; so also at present a change for the better in the minds of men, the darkness of error being dissipated, is to be hoped from the omnipotent power and assistance of God. Yet those natural aids, which, through the goodness of the Divine Wisdom disposing all things with firmness and sweetness, are at man's command, are neither to be despised nor underrated; and among these aids it is evident that the proper use of philosophy holds the first place. For God did not instil the light of reason into the human mind in vain; and the light of faith superadded, far from extinguishing or lessening the power of the intelligence, rather perfects it, and increasing its faculties renders it capable of greater things. Therefore, the economy of Divine Providence demands that, in recalling the nations to faith and salvation, the assistance also be sought of human science, and the monuments of antiquity attest that such was the practice of the most distinguished fathers of the Church. Indeed, the part which they assigned to reason was neither scanty nor insignificant, which the great Augustine has briefly expressed, when he "attributes to this science that by which wholesome faith . . . . is begotten, nourished, defended, and strengthened."[2]

And in the first place, philosophy, if rightfully used by the wise, is sufficient in a certain manner to smooth and prepare the way to the true faith, and to adapt the minds of its disciples to receive revelation; wherefore by the ancients it was fitly called, now, "a preparatory training for Christian faith;"[3] again, "the prelude and auxiliary of Christianity;"[4] at other times, "the schoolmaster that leads unto the Gospel."[5]

And, in fact, our most merciful God, in what concerns divine matters, did not manifest by the light of faith those truths alone, to grasp which

---

[1] 1 Cor. ii. 4.
[2] De Trin. lib. xiv. c. 1.
[3] Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. i. c. 16; i. vii. c. 3.
[4] Orig. ad Greg. Thaum.
[5] Clem. Alex. Strom. i. c. 5.

the human intelligence was unequal; but He also manifested certain others not entirely impervious to reason, so that by the help of divine authority they became known to all speedily and without any admixture of error. Hence it was, that certain truths which are either divinely proposed for belief, or linked by strong ties with the doctrine of faith, were known by the wise men of the Pagans by the natural light of reason alone, and by them demonstrated and defended by fitting arguments. For, as the Apostle says, "the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made:" His eternal power also and divinity; and the "Gentiles, who have not the law," show, nevertheless, "the work of the law written in their hearts." And it is highly proper to turn those truths known even to the Pagan philosophers to the advantage and utility of revealed doctrine, in order to show that even human wisdom and the testimony of its adversaries support the Christian faith. And it is evident that this method was not introduced recently, but is ancient, and was often used by the Holy Fathers of the Church. Nay, those venerable witnesses and guardians of religious traditions behold a certain type, as it were, and a figure of this in the fact of the Israelites, who, going out of Egypt, were ordered to carry with them the silver and golden vessels with the precious robes of the Egyptians, in order that, by a change of use, those utensils should be dedicated to the religion of the true Deity, which had formerly served ignominious rites and superstition. Gregory of Neocaesarea[1] praises Origen for this, that, with singular dexterity he turned many of the sentences ingeniously taken from the Pagans, like so many weapons snatched from the enemy, to the service of Christian wisdom and the destruction of superstition, and Gregory Nazianzen,[2] as well as Gregory of Nyssa,[3] praises and approves a similar method of disputing in Basil the Great. Jerome greatly commends this in Quadratus, a disciple of the Apostles, in Aristides, in Justin, in Irenæus, and in many others.[4] And Augustine says: "Do we not see, how richly laden with gold and silver and precious garments, Cyprian, that most persuasive doctor and blessed martyr, came out of Egypt? With how much Lactantius? With how much Victorinus, Optatus, and Hilary? To be silent about the living, with how much numberless Greeks have come out?"[5] And if natural reason scattered this abundant seed of doctrine before it became fecundated by the power of Christ, it will certainly fructify more abundantly after the grace of the Saviour has restored and increased the native faculties of the human mind. And who does not perceive that a plain and easy way is opened to faith by this kind of philosophy?

Yet the utility which proceeds from this method of philosophizing is not circumscribed within these limits. And, indeed, the words of divine wisdom seriously reprove the folly of those men who, "by these good things that are seen, could not understand Him that is, neither by attending to the works, have acknowledged who was the workman."[6] Therefore, in the first place, this great and excellent fruit is obtained from human reason, that it proves a God to exist; "for by the greatness of the beauty and of the creature, the Creator of them may be seen so as to be known thereby."[7]

Then it shows that God alone excels by the accumulation of all perfections, chiefly by His infinite wisdom, from which nothing can be hid-

[1] Orat. paneg. ad Origen.
[2] Vit. Moys.
[3] Carm. i., Iamb. 3.
[4] Epist. ad Magn.
[5] De doctr. Christ. l. ii. c. 40.
[6] Wisdom xiii. 1.
[7] Wisdom xiii. 5.

den, and by His sovereign justice, which no evil affection can ever overcome, and that God, therefore, is not only truthful, but is truth itself which cannot deceive or be deceived. Whence it is clear that human reason has a tendency to win for God's word the fullest belief and authority. In like manner reason declares, that the doctrine of the Gospel was resplendent from its very origin with certain wonderful signs, or evident proofs, so to speak, of manifest truth; and therefore all who give faith to the Gospel give it not rashly, *following*, as it were, *learned fables*,[1] but by a quite rational obedience submit their intelligence and judgment to the divine authority. Nor is it of less value that reason clearly establishes, that the Church instituted by Christ (as the Vatican Council declares), "on account of its marvellous extension, its eminent holiness, and its inexhaustible fruitfulness in all places, with its Catholic unity and invincible stability, is a great and perpetual motive of credibility and an irrefragable witness of its divine mission."[2]

After thus laying these solid foundations, a continued and manifold use of philosophy is still necessary, in order that sacred theology may receive and clothe itself with the nature, form, and character of a real science. For in this noblest of studies it is most necessary that the many and divers parts of heavenly doctrines be gathered into one body, and be suitably disposed, each in its own place, and springing from their proper principles, cleave together by an appropriate bond of union; finally, that each and all of them be confirmed by apt and invincible arguments. Nor must we pass over in silence or undervalue that more accurate and abundant knowledge of the things which are believed, and that more lucid understanding, as far as possible, of the mysteries of faith, which Augustine and other fathers praised and studied to obtain, and which the Vatican Synod itself[3] declared to be most excellent in its results. For they certainly more fully and easily obtain such knowledge and intelligence who, to integrity of life and a study of the faith, add talent cultivated by philosophical studies, especially as the same Vatican Synod teaches that this intelligence of the sacred dogmas must be derived "as well from the analogy of the things which are known naturally, as from the relation of the mysteries to each other, and to the final end of man."[4]

In the last place it also belongs to philosophical studies to guard religiously the truths divinely revealed, and to resist those who dare to attack them. In which matter it is the great praise of philosophy to be counted a bulwark of faith, and, as it were, a strong support of religion. "Our Saviour's doctrine, indeed," as Clement of Alexandria testifies, "is of itself a perfect doctrine, and needing nothing else, since it is the power and wisdom of God. And while Greek philosophy does not make truth more powerful, yet since it invalidates the arguments of the sophists against it, and repels their wily snares against truth, it has been called the fit hedge and fence of the vineyard."[5] For as the enemies of Catholicity, when about to attack religion, borrow their weapons of warfare from philosophical reasons, so the defenders of the divine sciences take much from the storehouses of philosophy with which to defend revealed dogmas. Nor is it to be reckoned a small triumph for Christian faith that human reason itself should powerfully and easily repel those weapons of the adversaries which they had forged by devices of human reason. St. Jerome, writing to Magnus, records that this species of religious warfare was used by the Apostle of the Gentiles himself: "Paul, the

---

[1] 2 Petr. i. 16. [2] Const. dogm. de Fid. Cath. cap. 3. [3] Const. cit., cap. 4.
[4] Ibid. [5] Strom., lib. i. c. 20.

leader of the Christian army and the invincible orator, fighting for the cause of Christ, by his art turns a casual inscription into an argument of the faith, for he had learned from the true David how to snatch the sword from the hands of the enemy and cut off the head of the proud Goliath with his own sword."[1] And the Church herself not only advises, but commands Christian teachers to require this assistance from philosophy. For, after the Fifth Council of the Lateran had established "that every assertion contrary to the truth of revealed faith is utterly false, because truth does not contradict the truth,"[2] it orders teachers of philosophy to exercise themselves studiously in unravelling insidious arguments, for, as Augustine says, "if reason be alleged against the authority of the divine Scriptures, however acute it may be, it deceives with the semblance of truth, for true it cannot be."[3] But in order that philosophy be found equal to bringing forth these precious fruits which we have mentioned, it is absolutely necessary that it never depart from that path which the venerable antiquity of the Fathers adopted, and the Vatican Council, by the weight of its authority, solemnly approved. In a word, since it is clear that many truths are to be accepted from the supernatural order, which go far beyond the grasp of any human intellect, let not human reason, conscious of its own infirmity, dare to affect what is beyond its power, nor deny these same truths, nor measure them according to its own strength, nor interpret them at pleasure; but let it rather receive them with a full and humble faith, and deem it the highest honor that she is allowed, after the fashion of a handmaid and follower, to enrol herself in the service of these heavenly doctrines, and, by God's blessing, attain to some knowledge of the same. Now, in those points of doctrine which the human intelligence can naturally perceive, it is certainly fair that philosophy should use its own method, principles, and arguments, not in such a manner, however, as to seem to withdraw itself boldly from the divine authority. Nay, since it is evident that what is known by revelation carries with it certain truth, and that what is opposed to faith is equally opposed to reason, the Catholic philosopher must know that he will violate the rights of both faith and reason should he accept any conclusions which he knows to be repugnant to revealed doctrine.

We know full well that there are some who, extolling beyond due bounds the faculties of human nature, contend that the human intelligence, when it has once submitted to the divine authority, falls from its native dignity, and, bowed down by some yoke, as it were, of slavery, is retarded very much and hindered from arriving at the fulness of truth and of its own perfection. But these sayings are full of error and deceit, and would lead to this, that men, quite foolishly, and no less ungratefully, should repudiate the higher truths, and of their own accord reject the divine blessing of faith, from which the fountains of every good flow upon society itself. For as the human mind is inclosed within fixed and, indeed, narrow limits, it is prone to very many errors, and liable to ignorance on many points. The Christian faith, on the contrary, since it rests on the authority of God, is a most infallible teacher of the truth, and he that follows it is neither subject to the snares of error nor tossed by the waves of uncertain opinions. Wherefore, they who add the study of philosophy to obedience to the Christian faith, philosophize well, because the splendor of the divine truths received in the mind aids the intelligence, and, far from detracting from its dignity,

[1] Epis. ad Magn.
[2] Bulla Apostolici regiminis.
[3] Epist. 143 (al. 7), ad Marcellin. n. 7.

adds much to its nobility, keen-sightedness, and vigor. And when they devote their mental energies to refuting opinions contrary to faith, and to proving what agrees with the same, they worthily and usefully employ reason; for, in the former case, they detect the causes of error and see the fault of the arguments on which they rest; in the latter, they master the force of the reasons by which they may be solidly proved, and bring home conviction to any prudent man. And he who thinks that by this study and exercise the resources and faculties of the mind are not increased and developed, must hold absurdly that the discrimination between truth and error is not conducive to the progress of the mind. The Vatican Council, therefore, properly notes in these words the distinguished benefits which are conferred upon reason by faith: "Faith frees and guards reason from errors, and furnishes it with manifold knowledge."[1] And therefore man, if he were wise, should not blame faith as being the enemy of reason and natural truths, but should rather render due thanks to God and rejoice exceedingly, because, amid many causes of ignorance and among the waves of error, the most holy faith has dawned upon him, and, like a friendly star, shows him the harbor of truth without any danger of going astray.

If you look back, Venerable Brethren, at the history of philosophy, you will perceive that what we have just said is proved by the facts themselves. For even those who were considered the wisest of the ancient philosophers, but who had not the gift of faith, erred most grievously in many things. You well know how often they taught, along with many truths, things false and absurd, and very many that were uncertain and doubtful, respecting the true nature of God, the first origin of things, the government of the world, the divine knowledge of futurity, the cause and origin of evil, man's last end and eternal happiness, respecting virtues and vices, and many other subjects, a true and certain knowledge of which is of the utmost importance to the human race.

On the other hand, the early doctors and Fathers of the Church,—who clearly understood from God's will and counsel that Christ, who is the power of God and the wisdom of God,[2] and "in whom are hidden all treasures of wisdom and knowledge," is also the restorer of human science,[3]—undertook to investigate the books of ancient sages and to compare their opinions with revealed doctrines, and, exercising a prudent discrimination, they adopted whatever they met with in them that was wisely thought and truly expressed, rejecting or correcting all the rest.

For as God, in His supreme Providence, for the defence of the Church raised up valiant martyrs, who counted their lives as nothing against the cruelty of tyrants, so, too, He opposed to the falsely-styled philosophers or heretics men of the greatest wisdom, who should defend, with the help also of human reason, the treasures of revealed truth.

Now, from the very beginning of the Church, Catholic doctrine had to encounter most bitter foes, who, in mockery of Christian dogmas and institutions, asserted that there were many gods, that the matter of the world was without beginning or cause, and that the course of all events was determined by some blind force and fixed necessity, and not ruled by the counsel of Divine Providence. But these teachers of false doctrine were speedily attacked by wise men, whom we call *Apologists*, who, under the guidance of faith, took their arguments from human science, by which they proved that one God, excelling in every form of perfec-

[1] Const. dogm. de Fid. Cath. c. 4. [2] 1 Cor. i. 24. [3] Coloss. ii. 3.

tion, is alone to be adored, that all things were produced from nothing by His omnipotent power, and that all things subsisted and were directed and moved to their proper ends by His wisdom.

Amongst these, St. Justin, martyr, justly takes the first place, who, after he had passed through the most celebrated academies of the Greeks, as if for the purpose of testing them, saw clearly, as he himself confessed, that truth could be drawn only from revealed doctrines, and, having embraced them with the greatest ardor, he vindicated them against false accusations, defended them boldly and fully before the Roman emperors, and harmonized with them not a few savings of the Greek philosophers. Quadratus and Aristides, likewise Hermias and Athenagoras, greatly distinguished themselves in this good work about the same time. Nor did Irenæus, the invincible martyr, Bishop of the Church of Lyons, obtain less glory in the same cause, who, when he refuted the perverse opinions of the Orientals, spread by the machinations of the Gnostics through the Roman Empire, explained, as St. Jerome states, the origin of the different heresies, and from what philosophic sources they had emanated.[1] Every one knows the disputations of Clement of Alexandria, which the same Jerome thus honorably mentions: "What is there in those disputations that is unskilful?—what is there that is not the very marrow of philosophy?"[2] With marvellous variety of treatment he discussed many things most useful for constructing a history of philosophy, for properly employing the art of dialectics, for harmonizing reason with faith. Him Origen followed, the most distinguished teacher of the school at Alexandria, eminently learned in the doctrines of the Greeks and Orientals. He published many elaborate works, admirably adapted to explaining the divine writings and to illustrating the sacred dogmas, which works, though as they now exist are not entirely free from error, nevertheless contain powerful arguments, by which he has added to the number and to the stability of natural truths.

Tertullian contends with heretics with the authority of the Sacred Word; with philosophers, philosophically, changing the nature of his weapons; he confutes them so acutely and so learnedly that he can say to them publicly and confidently, "*You are not our equals, as you suppose, either in science or knowledge.*"[3] Arnobius, also in his books published against the Gentiles, and Lactantius, especially in his Divine Institutions, with equal eloquence and vigor, strenuously labor to convince men of the truth of the dogmas and precepts of Catholic wisdom; not thus overturning philosophy as was the custom with the Academicians,[4] but conquering partly with their own weapons and partly with those drawn from the disputes of philosophers with each other.[5] The writings which the great Athanasius and Chrysostom, prince of orators, have left, touching the human soul, the divine attributes, and other questions of greatest moment, are, in the judgment of all, so excellent that nothing seemingly could be added to their acuteness and fulness. And, that we may not weary you by enumerating one by one the great men whom we might mention, we will add only the great Basil and the two Gregorys, who, when they went forth from Athens, that abode of all culture, fully instructed in all that philosophy could teach, employed the treasures of knowledge, which each of them had with the greatest industry gathered, in confuting heretics and instructing Christians.

But Augustine seems to have carried off, as it were, the palm from all others. Possessed of immense ability, and perfectly acquainted with

---

[1] Epist. ad Magn.
[2] Loc. cit.
[3] Apologet. § 46.
[4] Inst. vii. cap. 7.
[5] De opif. Dei, cap. 21.

science, both sacred and profane, he most strenuously contended, with ardent faith and with equal learning, against all the errors of his age. What topic of philosophy has he left untouched? Nay, what subject has he not most diligently investigated, either when he explained to believers the highest mysteries of faith or defended them against the senseless attacks of adversaries; or when, after scattering to the winds the fallacies of the Academicians or Manichæans, he securely established the foundations of human science and gave it a safe, enduring basis; or when he explored the reason and cause and origin of the evils with which men are afflicted? With what deep subtlety did he reason respecting the angels, the soul, the human mind, the will and its freedom; respecting religion and a happy life; respecting time and eternity; respecting even the nature of bodies that are subject to change! Subsequently, in the East, John Damascene, who followed in the footsteps of Basil and Gregory Nazianzen, and, in the West, Boëtius and Anselm, who taught the doctrines of Augustine, greatly enriched the inheritance of philosophy.

After this the doctors of the Middle Ages, usually called *Scholastics*, undertook a work of immense magnitude, namely, to diligently collect the fruitful and productive seeds of science, scattered throughout the voluminous tomes of the Holy Fathers, and to arrange them in order for the use and convenience of posterity. And it is well here, Venerable Brethren, to state more fully, in the words of that most wise man, our predecessor, Sixtus V., what was the origin, genius, and excellence of the scholastic method.

"By the divine gift of Him who alone gives the spirit of wisdom and knowledge and intellect, and who enriches His Church throughout all ages with new blessings, as there is need, and provides it with new defences, the scholastic theology was brought to light, which the two most glorious doctors, the angelic St. Thomas and the seraphic St. Bonaventure, most illustrious teachers of this system, have cultivated and adorned with great ability, industry, and with much toilsome care, and handed it down to posterity, admirably arranged and clearly explained in many ways. And, indeed, the knowledge and exercise of so wholesome a science, which flows down from the abundant sources of the Divine Word, of the Sovereign Pontiffs, of the Holy Fathers, and of Councils, has assuredly always been of great service to the Church, whether for clearly and truly understanding the Scriptures themselves or for more safely and profitably studying and explaining the Fathers, or for detecting and refuting different errors and heresies. But in those latter days in which the dangerous times described by the Apostle have come upon us, and men, blasphemers, arrogant, and seducers, grow worse and worse, erring, and driving others into error, it has become most necessary for confirming the dogmas of Catholic faith, and for confuting heresies."[1] Which words, although they seem to comprehend only scholastic theology, nevertheless, it is evident, must be understood as referring to and commending that philosophy also.

And, indeed, the excellent qualities which make the scholastic theology so formidable to the enemies of truth, to wit, as the same Pontiff adds, "the aptness and connection of things with each other, the coherence of causes, the order and disposition, like to the arrangement of soldiers in line of battle, the clear definitions and distinctions, the strength of the arguments, and the exceedingly acute disquisitions, by which light is distinguished from darkness, truth from error, the fallacies

[1] Bulla Triumphantis, An. 1588.

of heretics covered up in countless wiles and deceits are brought to view and exposed, and stripped, as it were, of their disguise'"[1]—these excellent and wonderful qualities, we say, are owing solely to the right use of that philosophy which the scholastic masters, exercising the utmost industry and consummate wisdom, were accustomed always to employ in theological discussions. Moreover, since it is peculiarly characteristic of the scholastic theologians that they joined in closest union both human and divine science, certainly that theology in which they especially excelled would not have obtained so much of honor and commendation in the opinions of men had they employed a maimed and imperfect or superficial philosophy.

But, indeed, of all the scholastic doctors, St. Thomas stands forth preeminently as prince and master, who, as Cajetan says, because he specially revered the sacred doctors of old, thus acquired, in a measure, the intelligence of them all.[2] Their doctrines, like the scattered members of a body, Thomas collected and united, arranged in admirable order, and enlarged, so that he is rightfully and deservedly esteemed the defender and glory of the Catholic Church. Truly he was indeed so apt and keen in intelligence, so quick and tenacious of memory, so pure of life, so singular a lover of truth, so richly endowed with knowledge of things, human and divine, that, like the sun, he nurtured earth with the warmth of his virtues, and filled it with the splendor of his doctrine. There is no part of philosophy which he has not acutely and also solidly handled. Of the laws of reasoning, of God and incorporeal substances, of man and other sensible things, of human actions and their principles he has discoursed in such manner that there is nothing wanting in him, either as respects the abundant number of questions, the fit arrangement of the members, the best method of procedure, the soundness of the principles, the strength of the arguments, the perspicuity and propriety of expression, and the facility of explaining whatever is abstruse.

This also must be added: that the angelic doctor examined philosophic conclusions with regard to the reasons and principles of things, which, being most comprehensive, and containing in themselves the germs of truths almost countless in number, were to be developed by later teachers at a proper time and with abundant fruit. And as in like manner he adhered to this method of philosophizing, in refuting errors, the wonderful result has been that he alone has confuted all the errors of past times, and at the same time supplied invincible weapons for overcoming those which were constantly to arise in future.

Moreover, distinguishing most clearly reason from faith, and nevertheless uniting both harmoniously, he preserved the rights of each and protected their respective dignity; so that reason, indeed, raised aloft on the wings of St. Thomas to the highest human eminence, could scarcely soar higher, and it was almost impossible even for faith to be supported by additional or stronger aids from reason than had been already furnished by Thomas.

For these reasons, most learned men, especially those of former times, highly renowned in theology and philosophy, after having searched, with untiring diligence, the immortal volumes of St. Thomas, devoted themselves to the study of his angelic wisdom, not simply to be trained therein, but rather to be thoroughly fed and nourished by the same. It is well known that all the founders and lawgivers of religious orders enjoined upon their members to study and adhere religiously to the doctrines of St. Thomas, warning them that no one of them should with

---

[1] Bull. cit.

[2] In 2m, 2æ., q. 148, a. 4, in fin.

impunity recede, even in the slightest degree, from the teachings of so great a man. Passing over the Dominican Order, which of right glories in this pre-eminently great teacher, the respective statutes of the Benedictines, Carmelites, Augustinians, of the Society of Jesus, and of very many other sacred orders, testify that they are bound by this same law.

And here we cannot but recall with great pleasure those highly celebrated academies and schools which formerly flourished in Europe, namely, Paris, Salamanca, Alcala, Douay, Toulouse, Louvain, Padua, Bologna, Naples, Coimbra, and very many others. How the renown of these academies increased with their age, and how their opinions were asked when matters of utmost moment were in dispute and had great weight with all parties concerned, there is no one that does not know. And it is well known, too, that in those great abodes of human wisdom, Thomas sat firmly enthroned as prince in his own realm, and that with wonderful unanimity the minds of all, masters and scholars, rested upon the teaching and authority of the angelic doctor.

But what is of more importance, the Roman Pontiffs, our predecessors, extolled St. Thomas with the highest encomiums and distinguished praise. For Clement VI.,[1] Nicholas V.,[2] Benedict XIII.,[3] and others declare that the universal Church is illumined with his admirable doctrine; St. Pius V.[4] moreover affirms that by the same doctrine heresies having been confuted and confounded were destroyed, and the whole world day by day freed from pernicious errors; others, with Clement XII.,[5] have testified that most abundant benefits have flowed forth from his writings upon the Church at large, and that St. Thomas himself is to be held in the same honor that is ascribed to the most eminent doctors, Gregory, Ambrose, Augustine, and Jerome: others, finally, do not hesitate to hold up St. Thomas to the great academies and lyceums as an exemplar and master whom they may safely follow. In this connection the words of the Blessed Urban V. addressed to the University of Toulouse seem eminently worthy of mention: "We wish, and by the tenor of these presents we enjoin, that you follow the doctrine of St. Thomas as true and Catholic, and that you strive with all your power to extend it."[6] Moreover, Innocent XI.[7] with regard to the University of Louvain, and Benedict XIV.[8] to the college of St. Denis at Grenada, repeated the injunction of Urban. In conclusion, to the opinions of the greatest Pontiffs, Innocent VI., as if raising a monument to St. Thomas's memory, adds the declaration: "*His* (Thomas's) *teaching above all others, the canonical writings excepted*, has such an accuracy of expression, such an arrangement of subjects, such a correctness of conclusions, that those who held to it have never been found to depart from the path of truth, and those who opposed it have always been suspected of unsoundness."[9]

Even Œcumenical Councils also, in which the very flower of wisdom culled from the whole world, shone forth, have delighted to hold St. Thomas in special honor. In the Councils of Lyons, Vienne, Florence, the Vatican, you might say that Thomas was present in the deliberations and decrees of the Fathers, and, as it were, presided over them, contending against the errors of the Greeks, the heretics, and the ration-

---

[1] Bulla In ordine. [2] Breve ad ord. FF. Praedic. 1451.
[3] Bulla Pretiosus. [4] Bulla Mirabilis. [5] Bulla Verbo Dei.
[6] Const. 5 a. dat. die 3 Aug. 1368 ad Cancell Univ. Tolos.
[7] Litt. in form. Brev. die 6 Aug. 1694. [8] Litt. in form. Brev. die 21 Feb. 1752.
[9] Serm. de St. Thom.

alists with overpowering force and the happiest results. And it was an honor reserved to St. Thomas alone, and shared by none of the other doctors of the Church, that the Fathers of Trent in their Hall of Assembly decided to place upon the altar, side by side with Holy Scripture and the Decrees of the Roman Pontiffs, the Summa of St. Thomas, to seek in it counsel, arguments, and decisions for their purpose.

Lastly, it may be considered as another triumph for this incomparable man that he should extort respect, praise, and admiration even from the enemies themselves of the Catholic name. For it is well known that amongst the leaders of heretical factions there have not been wanting those who declared, that if they could only get rid of the doctrine of St. Thomas, they could easily engage in a contest with all the Catholic doctors, and conquer them, and destroy the Church. The hope indeed was vain, but the testimony has its value.[1]

From these reasons and causes, Venerable Brethren, as often as we consider the excellence, the power, and the great advantages of his philosophic system so dear to our forefathers, we judge it a sad mistake that he has not always nor everywhere continued to receive due honor, especially since the daily practice and the opinion of the greatest men, and, what is above all, the approbation of the Church, have always evidently favored the scholastic philosophy. And into the place of the ancient doctrine a kind of new method of philosophy has, here and there, been introduced, from which have not sprung forth those desirable and wholesome fruits which the Church and civil society would have greatly preferred. For, owing to the endeavors of the innovators of the sixteenth century, men have chosen to philosophize without any regard whatever to faith, demanding and allowing unlimited liberty of thought according to each one's whim and liking. From this it quickly came to pass that systems of philosophy were unduly multiplied and that opinions diverse and often contradictory arose in regard to those things even which hold the first place in human cognitions. Who does not see that from this multitude of opinions frequently came hesitations and doubts; and from doubts the minds of men very easily glide into error?

But this desire of novelty, since men are influenced by imitation, seems also in some places to have pervaded the minds even of Catholic philosophers, who, disregarding the inheritance of ancient wisdom, prefer to strive after novelties rather than to augment and perfect the old with the new, and certainly not wisely and not without detriment to science. For this multifarious system of doctrine, which is based upon the will and authority of individual teachers, has an unstable foundation, and by reason of this it causes philosophy to be not firm, enduring, and robust, as was the ancient philosophy, but uncertain and unsteady. Therefore, if perchance it happens to such philosophy that she finds herself at times unequal to encountering the attacks of enemies, let her know that in herself reside the cause and the fault. When we say these things we most certainly do not blame the learned and intelligent men who devote their industry and research and the advantages of new discoveries to the study of philosophy; for we well know that this tends to the advancement of science. But there must be special care that such industry and research shall not constitute the whole or the principal part of their study. And we must judge in like manner of sacred theology. It is well that it be supported and illustrated by all the manifold aids of learning; nevertheless, it is most neces-

1 Beza, Bucerus.

sary that it should be treated in the grave manner of the scholastics, so that with the united strength of revelation and reason it may continue to be the "impregnable bulwark of faith."[1]

Therefore, with the soundest judgment not a few students of the science of philosophy, since they recently turned their attention to profitably reinaugurating philosophy, have striven, and are still striving, to restore the illustrious system of St. Thomas Aquinas to its former glory. With the utmost joy we have learned, Venerable Brethren, that many of your Order, with like good will, have eagerly entered upon the same path, whom we not only highly praise, but exhort to continue in their determination. But we remind all the rest of you, individually, that there is nothing more earnestly desired and wished for by us than that you all supply for the benefit of young students, plentifully and abundantly, those purest streams of wisdom that flow from the angelic doctor, as from an inexhaustible and precious fountain.

Many things lead us to desire this ardently. In the first place, indeed, since in our days it is usual to assail the Christian faith with the artifices and malicious subtleties of a certain deceitful wisdom, all the youth, and especially those on whom the Church builds her hopes, should, for this reason, be fed with the nourishing and strong food of doctrine, that, strong in their vigor, and furnished with an abundant supply of weapons, they may accustom themselves early to defend courageously and wisely the cause of religion, "*prepared always*," in accordance with the admonitions of the Apostles, *to satisfy every one that asketh a reason of that hope which is in us*,[2] *and to exhort in sound doctrine, and to convince the gainsayers.*[3] Moreover, very many of those men who, alienated in mind from the faith, hate Catholic institutions, profess that reason alone is their teacher and guide. For their cure and restoration to the Catholic faith, we judge that (excepting the supernatural assistance of God) nothing is more efficient than the solid doctrine of the Fathers and scholastics who, with so great clearness and force, have distinctly pointed out the firm foundations of the faith, its divine origin, its certain truth, the arguments with which it is supported, the benefits conferred by it on the human race, its perfect accordance with reason, that nothing more is needed to persuade the minds of men, even the most unwilling and obstinate.

Besides, domestic and civil society, which, to the certain knowledge of us all, is so sadly imperilled by the curse of pernicious opinions, would subsist much more securely and peacefully if the doctrines inculcated in the academies and schools were sounder and more accordant with the authoritative teaching of the Church, such as the works of St. Thomas contain. For the opinions of St. Thomas respecting the true nature of liberty now running into license, respecting the divine origin of every form of authority, respecting laws and their binding force, respecting the paternal and just dominion of sovereigns, respecting obedience to the higher powers, and mutual charity to all, have very great and indeed irresistible power for the overthrowing of those novel principles of legislation which are plainly seen to be perilous to a peaceful state of things and to the public weal. Finally, all human sciences may well entertain the hope of advancement and confidently expect a strong support from the reinstating of philosophic studies which we propose. For, from philosophy as from a wise governess the liberal arts are accustomed to borrow, and to drink in vital air as from a common source of life. It is proved by results and by constant experience that the liberal arts

[1] Sixtus V. Bull. cit. [2] 1 Peter iii. 15. [3] Titus i., 9.

especially flourished, when philosophy was in undisputed honor, and its wise decisions were respected. But they were neglected and were almost blotted out of existence, when philosophy decayed and became entangled with errors and absurdities.

Thus even physics, the study which is now held in such high esteem, and which by its many wonderful discoveries has secured to itself everywhere special admiration, will not only receive no detriment but a powerful help from the restoration of the ancient philosophy. For the consideration of facts and the observation of nature are not alone sufficient for the fruitful exercise and advancement of this study; but when the facts have been established one must rise higher, labor diligently to investigate the nature of corporeal things, to discover the laws which they obey, and the principles whence they derive their order, their unity in variety, and their mutual affinity in diversity. To which investigations it is wonderful what light and powerful aid is afforded by scholastic philosophy, if it be wisely handled.

In connection with which matter it is well to repeat a word of warning, viz., that some have most unjustly charged as a fault upon this same philosophy, that it is opposed to the advance and progress of the natural sciences. For, when the scholastics, following the opinions of the Holy Fathers, taught always in anthropology that human intelligence rises only from sensible things to the knowledge of those that are incorporeal and immaterial, they readily perceived that nothing was more useful to a philosopher than to diligently investigate the secrets of nature and engage long and earnestly in the study of physics. Which opinion they also confirmed by their practice. For, St. Thomas, Blessed Albertus Magnus, and other leaders of the scholastics did not give themselves to the study of philosophy in such way as excluded them from devoting much labor to the examination of the things of nature. Nay, there are not a few of their sayings and maxims on these subjects which recent teachers approve and acknowledge to be in accordance with truth. Moreover, in this very age, many eminent teachers of the physical sciences publicly and openly declare that there is no real conflict between the certain and established conclusions of modern physical science and the philosophic principles of the school.

Therefore, whilst we cheerfully and gladly declare that whatever has been wisely said, whatever has been profitably discovered and ascertained by any one whomsoever, should be accepted; we most strenuously exhort you, Venerable Brethren, that, for the defence and glory of the Catholic faith, the good of society, the advancement of all science, you reinstate and as widely as possible propagate the inestimable wisdom of St. Thomas. The wisdom of St. Thomas, we say; for if anything has been examined with too much subtlety by the scholastic doctors or taught without due consideration, if anything is inconsistent with the ascertained doctrines of a subsequent age, or, in fine, is in any manner improbable, it is not, by any means, our intention to recommend it to our age for imitation.

Furthermore, let masters carefully chosen by you, strive to imbue the minds of their pupils with the doctrines of St. Thomas, and to place clearly before them his superiority over others in solidity and excellence. Let the academies established already, or to be established hereafter by you, prove and defend this, and make use of it for the refutation of prevalent errors. And take care that suppositions may not be received as truths, nor things erroneous as sound; take care that the wisdom of St. Thomas shall be drawn from its very source, or at least from those streams which, derived from the original source, still flow clear

and pure, according to the certain and unanimous opinion of learned men; but see to it, that the minds of youth are kept back from those currents which some say flowed thence, but which in reality are strange and unwholesome waters.

But we well know that our endeavors will be of no effect, Venerable Brethren, unless He favors our common undertaking, who is called the *God of all Knowledge*[1] in the divine oracles, by which also we are admonished that "*every best gift and every perfect gift is from above, coming down from the Father of Lights*,"[2] and again, "*If any one want wisdom, let him ask of God who giveth to all abundantly, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him.*"[3] Therefore, let us in this follow the example of the Angelic Doctor, who never gave himself to reading or writing without having first recommended himself to God in prayer, and who has candidly acknowledged that, whatever he knew, he had not so much acquired by his own labor and study as received it through divine assistance. Therefore, let us all together, with humble and united supplication, implore God that He may send forth upon the children of the Church the spirit of knowledge and understanding, and may open their minds to comprehend wisdom. And, to obtain still more fruits of the divine goodness, interpose also with God the most efficacious assistance of the Blessed Virgin Mary, who is called the Seat of Wisdom; and, at the same time, invoke as intercessors St. Joseph, the most pure Spouse of the Virgin, and Saints Peter and Paul, the greatest of the Apostles, who renewed the world with truth when corrupted with the noisome pestilence of error, and filled it with the light of heavenly wisdom.

Lastly, relying upon the hope of divine assistance, and trusting in your pastoral zeal, we lovingly impart, in the Lord, the Apostolic Benediction, as a harbinger of heavenly favor, and a pledge of our especial benevolence, to all of you, Venerable Brethren, to the whole clergy, and to the people committed to each of you.

Given near St. Peter's, at Rome, the 4th day of August, in the year of our Lord 1879, and the second year of our Pontificate.

LEO PP. XIII.

---

[1] 1 Kings ii. 3. [2] James i. 17. [3] Ibid. i. 5.

BOOK NOTICES.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE: THE OLD ENGLISH PERIOD. By *Brother Azarias*. New York: D. Appleton & Co, 1879. 12 mo., pp. 214.

In this portion of his contemplated work, Brother Azarias traces the history and progress of English literature from its earliest period down to the tenth century, or rather down to the days of the Norman conquest. He gives not only what may be called its inner life and structure, which was narrow and scanty, especially in its earlier stages, and of which the records that survive are very few and unsatisfactory, but he traces at greater length and with much skill and research the outside influences that acted upon it, modifying and improving its character.

When the Jutes, Angles and Saxons left their native morasses to settle in Great Britain centuries ago, little did they dream that in their new home they were to become the nucleus of a race that was to figure so largely in the world's history, and accomplish so much of weal and woe for mankind. Any account of such a people, of their institutions, mode of life, religious and moral ideas and literature, such as it was, must be interesting to any reader. There must have been in these some latent germ of power and future greatness which it is pleasant to investigate. But upon close inquiry it is not so easy to discover wherein lay the hidden virtue that was insensibly moulding such elements into a great people. It was not their bravery, which verged on bloodthirstiness, for that they had in common with the other Nordic tribes. It was not freedom from the grosser vices, for they were the slaves of excess far beyond their neighbors. It was not their lofty respect for woman, of which they had very little, and in this respect were far excelled by the Celts. Tacitus, indeed, is quoted as a witness for the high position that woman held among the German tribes. But we must remember that according to many learned critics the author of *De Moribus Germanorum* is not so much writing a history as covertly satirizing the corrupt morals of Pagan Rome, and where exaggeration or fable gives more point to his satire he does not scruple to introduce it. It is not unlikely that whatever constitutes the worth of the English race (not taking the Norman element into account for the present) must have resulted from a happy blending of the Saxon element with its British predecessor. The better qualities of both races were retained and their faults dropped to some extent in the new combination. Prejudice has caused many writers to undervalue and minimize the British (or Celtic) element in the Anglo-Saxon compound. But Brother Azarias proves that it was much stronger and exercised more influence than many are willing to admit. This he confirms by the testimony of several late unprejudiced English writers, Morley, Davies, Matthew Arnold, and others. Years of contact with the foe they had subdued by treachery and force, but whom they had by no means expelled or exterminated, began to tell in some degree on their social life. It certainly acted on their literature. The heroine of the Saxon poet, who had hitherto differed from the cruel bloodthirsty warrior only by her sex, and whose type had been derived from the Hildas or Gundas of Norse Sagas, became by degrees more womanly. Transferred from the battlefield to the shady grove, what she lost in martial prowess, she gained in grace and beauty. And thus the fierce Bellona was happily transformed into a nymph more befitting the poet's dream. Nor was this change in the poetical character given to woman the only one. The

roving Celt had been everywhere, and had seen nature in all her aspects. He had ravaged the fair fields of Hellas and of sunny Italy. Though his march was that of a marauder, he had by nature an eye that could discern and a heart that warmed to the beautiful in all its forms. And the impress of these reminiscences is visible in his poetry. It was from him that the Saxon learned to impart to his song a poetic coloring drawn from nature, which he never could have acquired among the mists and fens of his continental home. This influence of Celtic on Saxon poetry is drawn out at some length and with great force and beauty by the author in the second chapter of the work.

Brother Azarias then proceeds to treat of the introduction of Christianity into Great Britain by the loving zeal of St. Gregory the Great, and shows how its civilizing power, amongst other beneficial effects on that people, improved and almost created anew their literature. He tells us in glowing pages of St. Hilda, Caedmon, Theodore and Aldhelm, Venerable Bede, Alcuin, Alfred, and the two Alfrics. No reader can fail to be charmed with the style in which our author has handled this portion of his subject. His account of Caedmon, in whose soul Christian zeal first awakened the hidden poetic fire, is in itself an exquisite poem.

The whole volume is written in Brother Azarias's best style, with happy elegance of diction, that flows without monotony, and by its varied beauty delights but never fatigues the reader. This, however, is only the preliminary portion of his work, and the way in which he has handled it makes us the more anxious to possess the coming volume, which will treat of more important matter, the development of English literature from the Norman conquest down to the present time. We hope and pray that God may preserve the author, in spite of his delicate health, for this and many other useful works.

It is the duty of a reviewer, that he owes to himself and his readers, to find fault occasionally as well as to praise. Hence we would call the attention of the learned author to the rather inexact way in which mention is made of St. Thomas and the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception near the end of the second chapter (p. 75). It is true that in a non-theological book all the minute nicety and precision of a professedly theological or controversial treatise are not required, and would perhaps often be out of place. But in a book intended for all classes of readers, Catholic and non-Catholic, whatever concerns the nature or history of our doctrines must be laid down at least with such distinctness as to leave no ground for misapprehension. The author, out of no other feeling than veneration for the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, calls it a "mystery to human reason." This appears to us scarcely correct. Her deliverance from the bondage of Satan entailed upon all the children of Adam is wonderful indeed, but quite in keeping with what we know of God's holiness on the one hand, and of the high station to which He chose her on the other. It was, it must be acknowledged, an act of His divine will, known only to Himself, and perhaps to His heavenly court, but hidden from all others. It would have remained unknown to us, but for His condescension in revealing it to the Church. But as soon as it becomes known, the justness and reasonableness of such truth are instantly recognized by the human mind that has been imbued with the teachings of Christianity. In the enunciation of mysteries properly so called, we know and can know nothing of the intimate relation between subject and predicate. We merely, by an act of faith, affirm their coexistence. But in the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, even independently of faith, reason sees and approves (so to speak) the fitness

of relation between the terms. Even those few, who in other days ventured to impugn it, never did so on abstract grounds of reason, but because they imagined it incompatible with some other point of Catholic doctrine, as for example, the character of original sin (as they understood it) or the universality of Christ's redemption. In the Church's creed, in spite of all theological explanations, there is yet some mystery overhanging the doctrine of original sin; but none in the Virgin Mother's exemption from it.

But was St. Thomas opposed to this doctrine and did he "demonstrate" the contrary in such way as to satisfy his own convictions? The reader of the passage to which we refer would be apt to draw this conclusion from the positive statement there laid down. The word *demonstrate* is not well chosen. For, even granting that St. Thomas did impugn the general belief, he did not seek to *demonstrate* his own opinion. He only tries to show that it is not in consonance with another doctrine of the Church, the universality of redemption. He is far from resting his opposition on the ground of "natural impossibility." He relies principally on the dangerous consequence that might follow. If she were immaculate from the first moment of her being, Christ would not have been her Saviour. But the whole Church now believes both, viz., that she was immaculate, and that she was saved by Him who is Saviour of all. And how was this done? "Intuitu meritorum Christi," "ex morte Filii praevisa," as we are told in the definition and in the prayer of the Church on the festival. Hence, the two things do not contradict each other. Yet, the high intellect of St. Thomas was satisfied (as is pretended) with this weak reasoning, while there was other and stronger that he might have drawn from the opinions of his school! This alone would be of itself sufficient to make us doubt whether he ever wrote the passages in question.

And this gives the true answer to the question proposed in the beginning of the foregoing paragraph. It is unfair to give a direct affirmative answer. For respectable authors, and not a few, maintain that not only the early printed texts, but even manuscript copies of the Angelic Doctor have been tampered with in this matter of the Immaculate Conception. In late editions of the *Summa* (Part iii., Quæst. xxvii., art. 2; see for example that of Benziger, 1875) there is a note to this effect, which deserves to be read, and from which it appears that this accusation has not originated since the definition, but is more than two centuries old. It is not our purpose, nor is this the place to argue the point. But the fact that there are theologians and critics who hold these passages to be spurious, should not be ignored, when it is asked whether he impugned the doctrine or not. Other theologians, without inquiring into the authenticity of the passages, have explained them satisfactorily as not in opposition with that doctrine which the Church has defined, and they appeal to various other places in his works where the doctrine is fully admitted. Our limits do not allow of further discussion of the subject, but enough has been said to show that it is, to say the very least, doubtful whether St. Thomas can be counted amongst the opponents of what is now defined doctrine. Whoever would like to see a list of all the distinguished writers who have come to the defence of the Saint, may find it in Morgott's late work, *Die Mariologie des hl. Thomas*, p. 76.

Another thing not to be lost sight of is that the enemies of the Church, not only heretics and unbelievers, but even some Catholics tainted with rationalism and infidelity, are never tired of repeating this story of the difference between the belief of the Church and that of her great mediæval Doctor. Above all, since the appearance of the Holy Father's

Encyclical, recommending a return to the teaching of St. Thomas, they have dinned into our ears this pretended contradiction. It becomes us rather to defend our great Saint and patron of theological science, than to acquiesce in charges, however void of intrinsic value, against his perfect orthodoxy. We have, therefore, every confidence that in the next edition of the book the few lines to which we have drawn attention, will be modified in such ways as to remove all possibility of misunderstanding. We esteem the learned author so highly and think so well of his book that we would not have it contain even one fault to mar its excellence, but that, on the contrary, every line of it should be such that *lector inoffenso decurrat pede*, as St. Jerome said of the books of one of his great predecessors.

INTRODUCTIO IN SACRAM SCRIPTURAM ad usum scholarum Pont. Seminarii Romani et Collegii Urbani de Propaganda Fide, auctore UBALDO UBALDI, Presbytero Romano S.S. Literar. Professore. Vol. ii. Introductio Critica, Pars Secunda et Tertia. Romæ: ex Typographia Polyglotta S. C. de Propaganda Fide. MDCCCLXXVIII. Large 8vo., pp. 643.

In a former number (July, 1877) we gave some account of the first volume of this work, which is classical of its kind. We are ashamed that we have so long delayed to notice the present volume. It is nowise inferior to its predecessor, for in it is seen the same learning, the same accuracy of critical judgment, and, what is most important in a text-book, the same *lucidus ordo*. The author, besides great learning, displays throughout a most rigid impartiality, rarely to be found except among Catholic controversialists, in stating fairly and accurately the opinions and theories of Protestants or Rationalists, and allows all due weight to their objections. His unswerving devotion to truth is manifested by the fact, that he not only will not admit but sets himself to refute the opinions of Catholic divines, whose reasons do not convince him, though they would strongly support Catholic doctrine. We may mention for example his discussion of the Canon of Esdras. He defends the final closing of the canon under Esdras and rejects the contrary opinion held by learned Catholic authors, which would readily dispose of all objections against the so-called Deutero-canonical books of the Old Testament.

In his first volume the author had treated of the sacred books as to their human or historical authority, showing that they are, to say the least, as worthy of belief as any of the most authentic and most accredited profane historians. But besides this human authority they have also a supernatural character, being of divine origin, which immeasurably exalts them above all other books. In them Christianity finds the foundation of her faith and of her hope, a summary of religious belief, and a code of morals for her children. In this light they have always been regarded by the Church of the Old and of the New Testament. Hence the distinction of their divine or intrinsic, and canonical or extrinsic authority. The former they have of themselves, the latter they receive from the testimony and sanction of the Church. The author very judiciously refuses to follow the example of those tractatists, who invert the natural order of these two subjects, the divinity and the canonicity of the holy books, treating first of the latter and then of the former. He properly considers the reversed order the more scientific of the two. Accordingly, in the first section of the volume he discusses the divinity, and in the second section the canonicity of the sacred writings. The disputes between Catholics and those outside, as to the means of ascertaining when a book is of divine origin, and which are the books that

can claim this privilege, or what is the true canon, are treated as occasion offers in either section.

In the first section Dr. Ubaldi unfolds at some length the true Catholic idea of inspiration as defined by the Tridentine, and more fully still by the Vatican Council; and rejects the loose theories of mere negative assistance or partial inspiration, that refers only to doctrinal points, or *subsequent* inspiration, the very name of which theory betrays its absurdity. And here the reader may find a full historical account of the famous propositions attributed to Lessius and Du Hamel, but in reality, if not coined, at least foully misstated by those worthy precursors of Jansenism, the disciples of Baius. The actual, not the forged, propositions have never been condemned by the Church. In giving a clear and full historical synopsis of this whole affair, Dr. Ubaldi has rendered a great service to the student of Scripture; for these propositions though much talked about are not thoroughly understood by many, and to correctly judge of them some knowledge of their history is required. And this can only be obtained from books that are seldom within the reach of students. In this section also the author begins to discuss the question: How are we to arrive at the certainty that the Scriptures are inspired? He shows that there is no possible way of getting at the truth with certainty unless by the external testimony of a divinely commissioned witness. He easily refutes the *criteria* formerly proposed by those who rejected the Church and her authority; namely, the sublimity of style and matter in the Scriptures, inward feeling, and the testimony of the Holy Ghost in the heart of the reader. These miserable subterfuges no longer delude the Protestant world. It has become ashamed of them, in spite of the Synod of Dort and the Westminster Confession. In fact, these *criteria* are no longer needed. Sincere Protestants of the unlettered sort believe, as they always did, in spite of their theory, on the Catholic principle of authority. Amongst the learned there is scarcely one who fully believes in inspiration, or indeed is aware of its true meaning. The inspiration they hold to does not deserve the name, for it is of the loosest kind, and has the rationalistic, unchristian stamp.

To the second section, which treats of the Canonicity of Scripture, Dr. Ubaldi devotes the principal portion of the volume, nearly 400 pages. He examines first, whence is it that we may learn with certainty the entire canon (or list) of the Divine books, and proves clearly by exclusion that the authority of the Church is the only source whence such certainty can be derived. He then gives quite a learned history of the canon of Scripture both in the Old Testament and in the New. It is as full and exhaustive a statement as could be compressed into a textbook. After this he enters upon an elaborate vindication of the truth of the canon that was approved by the Fathers of Trent. In his first volume he had already sufficiently explained in what sense our Vulgate was declared authentic by the same fathers. As the principal difficulty urged by Protestants and Rationalists against the Tridentine canon lies in the deutero-canonical books, so it is to their defence mainly that the learned Professor applies himself in this portion of the volume. He proves his point by explicit testimonies of proto-canonical Scripture, by the implicit approval bestowed on the Alexandrine (or Septuagint) version by our Lord and His Apostles, and by the perpetual tradition of the Church. In addition to these ordinary proofs he adds some others of a most interesting character drawn from the treasures of Sacred Archæology, and especially from its latest discoveries. Finally, a good account (lacking in most textbooks) is given of the Apocryphal and lost

books of Scripture. And this concludes the second part of our author's work.

The third part is devoted to what is called the Verbal Criticism of the Hebrew and Greek text of the Old and New Testament respectively. He traces the history of this portion of Biblical science from the earliest times down to the Masora, and thence down to our own day. The canons or rules of this criticism are given as laid down by the best authors. Thus, for example, the Masoretic text of the Old Testament is to be considered as possessing great weight, but not as infallibly certain. To prove this canon by example as well as by theoretical reasons, and to rebuke Hebraizing Christians and worshippers of the Masora, who invariably prefer it, to the Vulgate or Septuagint, our author selects three places of the Old Testament where he justly contends (and proves it at some length), that the readings of the Masora must give way before our ancient versions. The passages are Josue xxi. 36, 37, where two entire verses found in all our modern Bibles, are omitted in the Hebrew text, or marked as spurious in the margin; the second, Gen. xlix. 10, where the present text has *Shiloh;* the third Ps. lxxi. (or xxii.) 17, where the Jewish reading is *caari.* Dr. Ubaldi shows evidently that by all canons of criticism the omission in Josue is a manifest error, and that the Jewish readings in the other two places alleged, are most probably erroneous. In Gen. xlix., we should read *shello* (He to whom it belongs) instead of *shilo* (the Peaceful One); in Ps. xxi., *caaru* or *caru* (they have dug), instead of *caari* (like a lion). So clear is this, that the Anglican version, which professes to follow the Hebrew text in preference to the Vulgate, is ashamed to follow its guide in two of these places, and falls back on the Catholic version. It restores the omitted verses of Josue, and translates the word of the Psalm by "they have pierced." It would have been more to the credit of their boasted version had they oftener preferred the Vulgate readings to those of the Masoreths in the Old Testament, and to those of the Textus Receptus in the New.

While treating of Verbal Criticism and giving its history, the author was led naturally to speak of the famous system of *families* or recensions, on the discovery of which modern Biblical criticism once prided itself. He shows very clearly the aberrations of some favorers of this system, which has its grain of truth, however, in spite of their chaff. But in practice, the system works badly, and has introduced confusion rather than order into Biblical science. Dr. Ubaldi therefore establishes the principle that the system of "families," though having a theoretical ground of truth, in its practical application is so uncertain, so beset with difficulties, that it is of not much use in determining the text of the New Testament; much less can it be set down as the foundation of all verbal criticism of the sacred text. Yet the principle of the system may be used occasionally to advantage, and he lays down rules for its proper use. Instead of the recent divisions and subdivisions of the Alexandrine, Byzantine, and other recensions, he prefers the old and simpler division with which Bengel started, viz., African and Asiatic, or Western and Eastern. But besides rules of criticism for the correct use of the "families," when that system is followed, he gives other canons more in accordance with his own views, whenever the verbal criticism of the text is undertaken without any reference to the "family" system. At the end of the volume there are tables containing phototype and photolithographic illustrations of the archæological monuments referred to, and also of the principal MSS. of the Bible, such as the Vatican Codex, the Codex Sinaiticus, the "Ephraemi Rescriptus," the Urbino-Vatican, etc. Amongst them is a fac-simile of the famous Hebrew MS.

called "of Odessa," now in St. Petersburg, and which dates from A. D. 916; also of a Greek MS. of Grotta Ferrata, of the eleventh century, which (like the Urbino-Vatican) seems never to have been collated.

We must congratulate Dr. Ubaldi and his disciples on having completed so much of his learned and most praiseworthy labors. The volume that is to follow will contain, it is said, the Introductio Exegetica with Biblical Archæology. And then we shall be in possession of a full and magnificent textbook for Biblical Science, not only good for colleges and universities, but of great value for those clergymen who wish to continue and improve their Biblical studies. And if he but made a compendium of it, as he has partly promised, there could be no better class-book for our American seminaries.

THE HUMAN SPECIES. By *A. De Quatrefages*. International Scientific Series. New York, D. Appleton & Co. 1879.

The partisans of evolution have possessed themselves of so many of the scientific periodicals of the day, that we are sometimes apt to forget the existence of a goodly number of eminent men and leaders of thought, who, in the scientific camp itself, are striking sturdy blows against the doctrine. Yet, in fact, it is but a short time since Mr. Darwin candidly confessed that "of the older and more honored chiefs in natural science, many unfortunately are still opposed to evolution in every form." The present work of M. De Quatrefages comes in good time to confirm this admission, and to prove that these venerable chiefs are not without solid reasons, based on well-known facts, for their unwillingness to follow in the rank and file of evolution.

The book is an account of the author's views on the science of Anthropology in its present condition, together with the work which has been done in the past to bring it to this condition. It is divided into ten books, under the following heads: Unity of the Human Species; Its Origin, Antiquity, Original Localization; Peopling of the Globe; Acclimatization of the Human Species; Primitive Man; Formation of the Human Races; Fossil Human Races; Present Human Races; Physical Characters; Psychological Characters of the Human Species.

M. De Quatrefages begins by endeavoring to settle clearly the meaning of the term *species* in the animal and vegetable kingdom; a notion which the evolutionist doctrines now current have done much to obscure. *Species*, according to his definition, is "a collection of individuals, more or less resembling each other, which may be regarded as having descended from a single primitive pair by an uninterrupted succession of families." *Resemblance*, therefore, and *filiation*, are the two elements essential to species. *Variety* is "an individual, or a number of individuals belonging to the same sexual generation, which is distinguished from the other representatives of the same species by one or several exceptional characters." When the characters peculiar to a variety become hereditary, a *race* is formed. That the various groups of beings to which the term species has always been applied, are really and permanently distinct from each other, independently of the conceptions of the mind, and in spite of variations in form, color, and even structure, is shown by the fact, that however widely races of the same species may differ among themselves, the product of a union of these races is fertile, in some cases more so than when two individuals of the same race are brought together; whereas when species, long recognized as distinct by other characters, are crossed, we not only require unusually favorable circumstances to insure an offspring, but that offspring is invariably

sterile. We have, therefore, in this general law, established by numberless and incontestable facts, a touchstone of the identity of species. Applying this test to man it becomes evident beyond a doubt that the unity of the human species is the only hypothesis which science can admit. Moreover, the variations of the different races of men from any uniform type, on which the polygenists chiefly rely to prove the multiplicity of species, and consequently of origins for man, are far less than those which exist among many races of animals acknowledged by all to belong to the same species. This is especially the case in our domestic animals, the dog and the ox, for example, which under our care have been subjected to multiplied causes of variation. But can this variation of *races* go so far as to break down the barriers of *species*, according to the requirements of the evolutionist hypothesis? Our author believes that it cannot, and shows that such a supposition is in direct contradiction to the existing law of the mutual sterility of species and fertility of races, a law, which so far as we can ascertain from geological records, has undoubtedly existed from the very earliest ages. Without it the animal and vegetable worlds would have been quickly reduced to inextricable and indescribable confusion ; yet everywhere, in the past as well as the present, order and definite division appear. This could not be were all species the descendants of a common primitive stock. To evade this difficulty Mr. Darwin says : "Since species do not owe their mutual sterility to the accumulative action of natural selection, and a great number of considerations show us that they do not owe it to a creative act, we ought to admit that it has been produced incidentally during their gradual formation. and is connected with some unknown modification of their organization." "Thus," as M. De Quatrefages remarks, "in order to admit the physiological transmutation (evolution) of race into species, an assumption which is contrary to all positive facts, Darwin and his followers reject the secular results of experience and observation, and substitute in their place a *possible accident*, and *the unknown*. The Darwinian theory relies entirely upon the possibility of this transmutation. We see upon what data the hypothesis of this possibility rests. Now, in a truly liberal spirit, I ask every unprejudiced man, however little he may be conversant with science, the question, Is it upon such foundations that a general theory in physics or chemistry would be founded ?"

The arguments which De Quatrefages brings against the theories of Darwin and Haeckel are many and weighty. Yet in the question of the antiquity of man he is not only fully in accord with the dominant school, but goes far beyond its more moderate members. He not only concedes the existence of man in Quaternary times, but maintains that he was on earth during the Pliocene epoch of the Tertiary age, and even as far back as the Miocene ; that is to say, that his existence covers a period which, though very uncertain in its exact duration, is reckoned by geologists in hundreds of thousands of years. The proofs on which he founds this belief consists chiefly in some bones of the balœnotus, bearing deep incisions, which were found by Capellini in the Pliocene deposits of Tuscany in 1876, and a number of flints which appear to have been worked and shaped by human hands, and which the industrious Abbé Bourgeois found in formations belonging to the Miocene epoch. These are but slight grounds on which to rest the solution of so momentous a question as the antiquity of man. Especially is this the case when we reflect that it is but a few months since Mr. Huxley made the distinct admission that there is, as yet, no conclusive evidence

of the existence of man before the Quaternary period; while Virchow has expressed himself no less clearly in the same sense.

The other portions of the work, though not perhaps of so vital importance at the present time as those which we have mentioned, are ably written and full of interest. When, however, in his introduction, M. De Quatrefages asserts that there is no essential difference between the intelligence of man and the cognoscitive powers of brutes, he falls into a grave philosophical error. It is true that there are cognoscitive powers, and those of wonderful perfection, common to man and the brutes; such as the imagination, memory, and internal sense. It is true, too, that man has passions, desires, and impulses, in a word, "the sensitive appetite," as the scholastics call it, in common with the brutes, and that he too often allows his reason to be drowned in imagination and his will to follow the appetite, in true brute fashion. But will M. De Quatrefages point out to us a single instance in which a brute has performed actions denoting clearly the *apprehension of the universal*, and of that which is *entirely abstract*. It is in this that the distinction between godlike intelligence and sense consists. When our author places the essential distinction between man and animal in the religious and moral faculties, he is trying to build up what he has just pulled down. For what is that *religious* or *moral sense*, which thinks and judges of religion and morality, but the reason itself, acting on these subjects rather than others? And it is because the intelligence of man is capable of conceiving the abstract, that it can conceive the idea of religion.

But want of space will not permit our dwelling longer on this subject. In spite of the great defects at which we have hinted, the work is a most valuable one, and should rank among the very best of the late contributions to our popular science literature.

La Nouvelle Atala; ou la Fille de l'Esprit. Legende Indienne. Par *Chata-Ima* (de la Louisiane). Nouvelle Orleans: Imprimerie du Propagateur Catholique. 1879. Pp. 148.

The author of this beautiful little book is the Rev. Mr. Rouquette, disguised under the Indian name of Chata-Ima. Its appearance was for us a surprise, as welcome as it was unexpected. We had heard nothing of our friend since the gloomy days when his native State lay prostrate under the heel of those formidable warriors—*duo fulmina belli*, as they used to be represented by the veracious chroniclers of war-times, Generals Butler and Banks. Then came peace, so-called, bringing with it a desolation perhaps more unendurable than the miseries of war. And it was natural to fear that the horrible indignities to which his beloved Louisiana was subjected by the ribald crew that ruled or ravaged it for years, detested by its citizens but supported by outside bayonets, might have preyed upon his mind and worn out his delicate bodily frame. He would not have been the first of poetic mould whose

> "Fiery soul, while working out its way,
> Fretted the puny body to decay,
> And o'er informed its tenement of clay."

But such fears were vain. We are glad to learn that he yet lives, though it be in the wild seclusion of the forest, surrounded by his dear Indians, for whom he has built a church, and to whose spiritual needs he has devoted his life and ministry. They know him only by the endearing name of Chata-Ima. For such we know it to be, having once heard it explained, though the explanation has faded away from our memory.

The Rev. Adrian Rouquette (like his brother Dominic) is a true poet and is well known for his *Antoniade*, *Trois Ages*, *Proêmes Patriotiques*, and other poems. But his muse is not confined to the French tongue. When it pleases her, she soars aloft in English strains. A volume of his poems in this language was highly extolled in the *Southern Quarterly Review*, some twenty-five years ago, by no less a critic than William Gilmore Simms.

That he is a poet will be recognized by any one who reads the Nouvelle Atala, which is really a charming little poem in prose. Simple as a tale of romance, it is of a far higher order than the books of fiction which form the delight of the century. In real merit it surpasses even many of those which have emerged from the crowd and gained for themselves a widespread reputation. We will not mar the reader's pleasure by any foretaste of the heroine's history, as sketched by our author. The spiritual beauty of her face in the picture which adorns the frontispiece, tells of a being etherealized by separation from the world and its gross herd, and by perpetual communion with Nature and Nature's God.

We warmly commend to our readers this exquisite little idyl, replete with the beauties of Nature and of Faith. It breathes the balmy air of our Southern forests, but is even still more redolent of the fragrant perfume of religion. And we venture to predict that no one who takes up this little book will lay it down until he has got through the entire volume.

De Virtutibus Infusis Prælectiones Scholastico-Dogmaticæ quas in Gregoriana Universitate habebat A.D. MDCCCLXXVIII–IX. *Camillus Mazzella*, Soc. Jesu in eadem Universitate Sacræ Theologiæ Professor. Romae: ex Typographia Polyglotta S. C. de Propaganda Fide, MDCCCLXXIX. Large 8vo., pp. 791.

The distinguished author, to the great regret of his brethren in Maryland, was some time ago summoned from Woodstock to Rome, to fill one of the chairs of Theology in the Roman College, or, as it is officially styled, the Gregorian University, from the name of its founder, Gregory XIII. That he has not been idle in his new field of labor is sufficiently attested by the splendid volume before us. It treats of the three great infused virtues, Faith, Hope, and Charity, commonly known as the theological virtues, and so called because they are by God alone infused, and became known only from divine revelation, but above all because they have God for their immediate object. This, however, does not exclude the infusion of other moral virtues, as the author shows from Innocent III., the Council of Vienne, the Roman Catechism, and the Fathers.

One might wonder at such a large volume written upon the theological bearings of Faith, Hope, and Charity. But if he will only run his eye over the questions discussed by F. Mazzella, and thus get some idea of their number and importance, he will rather wonder how the learned author has contrived to give so much in a comparatively small space. There are a hundred intricate questions connected with Faith alone, which would fill volumes, on some of which a great deal of light has been thrown by the definitions of the late Vatican Council. And to these F. Mazzella has devoted special attention. Indeed he makes no secret of his design to give in this part of his work a full commentary on the Vatican *Constitutio de Fide*. But there remain other obscure questions yet undefined, and which are debated *hinc inde* with varying solutions in the schools. All Christians know that in believing they are giving

their assent to the truth that God reveals, nor do they ever trouble themselves (nor is it necessary) with analyzing the nature of that assent. But this is the duty of the theologian. He must separate belief or assent from that trust or confidence (*fiducia*) with which some ignorantly or maliciously confound it; he must determine what part has the intellect, and what the will, in eliciting the act of faith; further, what is the character of the judgment passed on the motives of credibility before assenting, and many questions of a like kind. Indeed F. Mazzella devotes nearly six-sevenths of his large volume to Faith alone. We regret that we have not room at present to give a full synopsis of the more important portion of this treatise, especially where the author speaks of the *assensus fidei* and of the relation of Faith to Science. In another number we shall return to the subject.

We hope that all those who have Father Mazzella's other volumes, will add this to their collection. They will find it a valuable mine of information on some of the vital questions of the day.

Is Life Worth Living? By *William Hurrell Mallock*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1879. 12mo. Pp. 323.

This book is both interesting and remarkable from whatever standpoint it may be viewed. The English is clear and nervous. What the author has to say he says well. When the substance of the subject-matter first appeared, nearly three years ago, in a London periodical, it created a sensation, and ever since an article from the pen of Mr. Mallock was sure to command a wide circle of readers. He looks the issues of the day full in the face, and questions them till, dropping figure and allegory, enigma and illusory phrasings, they give the true answers. The author has an acute intellect. He searches and probes, analyzes and dissects with precision and accuracy. All this makes his book delightful reading. Each chapter reminds one of a dialogue of Plato. It abounds in the same Socratic irony. The author can be playful or serious, as the point at issue requires him to be.

The book—though its several chapters originally appeared in periodicals—has a unity of plan. It may be divided into three parts. In the first, the author unmasks Positivism, and shows that whatever is good and wholesome in the moral standard it would establish is neither more nor less than the old-time morality of Christianity. Eliminate that, and a reign of dulness is inaugurated, in comparison with which the chaos of Pope's *Dunciad* were respectable. In the second part the author turns to Protestantism for a solution of his questionings. But Protestantism he finds a blank. It is to him—as it is to every logical mind—the negation of the supernatural order. "We are at last beginning to see in it neither the purifier of a corrupt revelation, nor the corruption of a pure revelation, but the practical denier of all revelation whatever" (p. 268). Finally, the author shows that in the Catholic Church alone is to be found a refuge against the encroachments of Atheism, and that the only two poles of thought which human reason can logically rest in are either Atheism or Catholicity. This is the outcome of the book. The conclusion is startling, when we remember that it was penned by one who is an outsider—a skeptic. But all honor to him for possessing the moral courage to speak his convictions.

Mr. Mallock is stronger in analysis than in synthesis. With keenest critical acumen he exposes the subterfuges which the skeptical optimism of the day resorts to, in attempting to conceal its illogical conclusions and self-contradictions; but his references to Catholicity are open on some

points to objection, as are also his ideas of the inability of human reason to arrive at any knowledge of God.

De Re Sacramentaria Prælectiones Scholasticæ-Dogmaticæ, quas in Collegio SS. Cordis Jesu ad Woodstock, maxima studiorum domo Soc. Jesu in Fœd. Americæ, Sept. Statibus habebat A.D. MDCCCLXXVIII–IX. *Æmilius M. De Augustinis*, S.J., in Eodem Collegio Theol. Dogmaticæ Professor. Libri duo posteriores: de Pœnitentia, de Extrema Unctione, de Ordine, de Matrimonio. Woodstock, Marilandiæ: ex officina Typographica Collegii. MDCCCLXXIX. Large 8vo., pp. 780.

We have already called attention to the first volume of Father De Augustinis's admirable work. This second and last volume contains his treatises on the four last Sacraments out of the seven, viz., Penance, Extreme Unction, Holy Orders, and Matrimony. It is written in the same spirit, on the same plan, and with the same clearness that marked the preceding volume, and indeed characterizes the whole Woodstock Course. While confuting the enemies of the Church and stoutly defending dogma, or defined truth, it also seeks to enter further into the *penetralia* of Catholic doctrine, and investigate more clearly those portions of it on which the Church has pronounced no judgment. In other words, his theology is scholastico-dogmatic, as the title of the book professes.

Any one who runs his eye over its pages, and sees the quotations that constantly occur from St. Thomas and the great divines of his school, will readily see how much truth there is in the assertion, that the Encyclical of Leo XIII. was aimed at the Jesuits for their pertinacity in rejecting the authority of St. Thomas. To give only one example, our author abandons nearly the entire body of modern theologians (that is of our day) who hold that the five original Minor Orders have in them no sacramental dignity or efficacy, and goes back to the opinion of St. Thomas (followed by Bellarmine), who teaches that these Orders have in them the true nature of a Sacrament.

The Life of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ and of His Blessed Mother, Numbers 1–18. Translated and Adapted from the Original of Rev. L. C. Businger, by *Rev. Richard Brennan, A.M.*, Pastor of St. Rose's Church, New York, author of "A Popular Life of Pope Pius IX.," etc., etc. New York, Cincinnati, and St. Louis, Benziger Brothers.

It seems almost needless for us to add our tribute of praise in favor of this work, which has already received high commendation from so many Catholic prelates and from the Catholic press. Among the various biographies of our Lord in the English language, we know of none that is superior to this in general excellence and practical value for lay Catholics.

The work opens with a brief reference to our Lord's eternal generation in the bosom of the Father, and to the creation of the world, the history of the transgression of Adam and Eve, the promise made to them, and the preparation for the fulfilment of that promise by the partial revelations made to the patriarchs and prophets under the Old Law, until in the fulness of time it pleased God to assume in the womb of the Blessed Virgin humanity in union with the Second Person of the Trinity, and to be made man; and thus to consummate the sublime fact of the Incarnation, and the redemption of mankind.

This part of the author's task occupies the first fourteen numbers of the work, and is very satisfactorily and successfully performed. Numbers fifteen and sixteen carry forward the history of our Saviour to the immediate preparation for our Lord's public ministry, embracing the period of his infancy, childhood, and youth, and the events that then

took place with reference to Himself, His Holy Mother, and to St. Joseph, so far as they can be gathered from sacred history and tradition. Parts seventeen and eighteen are occupied with the immediate preparation for our Saviour's public ministry, and with His public life, up to the Sermon on the Mount.

The work is profusely illustrated, and the paper and letter-press are excellent.

FIDEI ET MORUM FUNDAMENTA Seu Instructio Brevis pro omnibus, qui salutem in veritate quærunt, nec expeditam rei tanti momenti investigandæ opportunitatem habent. Auctore *I. Van Luytelar, C.SS.R.*, Neo Eboraci, etc. Benziger Fratres Summi Pontificis Typographi, 1879.

This little book is good and solid enough, though written in rather rough Latin. We cannot but commend the zeal and good intentions of the reverend author; but neither can we help putting to ourselves the question, *cui bono?* For whom does the author write? For those who, as the title of the book says, "are seeking salvation through the truth" (or "seeking earnestly," as it may perhaps mean), "and cannot readily find an opportunity of investigating an affair of such importance." But will these men, whom infidelity or heresy keeps outside of the Church, and who have no opportunity of investigating, that is, of reading the controversial books in English, which surround them on every side, and which are as excellent as they are abundant—will these men have leisure enough to study a Latin book, though of small compass, even if they knew the language, which is not at all probable? And even if they had leisure and knowledge sufficient, is it likely that they would have the inclination? It will be said perhaps that the priest may make himself master of the contents of the book, and then use them in dealing with those who either believe wrongly or believe nothing. But this surely is a circuitous way, and one that does not agree with what is expressed on the title-page.

Though the author's laudable purpose and zeal for the diffusion of truth are worthy of all praise, we fear his book will fall under the general principle: "*Non sunt multiplicanda entia sine necessitate;*" and in the present case we may add, "*nec sine utilitate.*"

HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY; the Celebration of its Fiftieth Anniversary, or Golden Hill Jubilee, on June 24th, 1879. By *Walter H. Hill, S.J.* St. Louis, 1879.

Both the scope and the value of this work go far beyond what its unpretentious title suggests. In connection with its account of the founding and history of St. Louis University, it narrates the establishment and progress of the Society of Jesus in Missouri, and the spread of its missions in the adjacent States and Territories. It also contains biographical sketches of many of the Jesuit fathers and missionaries whose labors contributed directly or indirectly to the success of the University. Then, too, there are a number of very interesting references to Catholic institutions and foundations in Maryland, Louisiana, Massachusetts, and Kansas, with which the Jesuit fathers are, or were, more or less closely connected.

The learned author has thus embodied in his work many very important facts, which have never before appeared in print, connected with the beginning and progress of the Church in what, until very recently, was known as the Great West. These facts, learned through conversation with early missionaries, Father Hill carefully noted down, and thus preserved what otherwise would have been irretrievably lost. With char-

acteristic modesty he apologizes for introducing into his book what is not directly connected with its immediate subject. But in giving to the public the facts and incidents referred to, he has both added to the interest of the book itself, and preserved materials of great value to the future writer of the history of Catholicity in the United States.

A Latin Grammar. Founded on Comparative Grammar. By *J. H. Allen* and *J. B. Greenough*. Revised edition. Boston: Ginn & Heath. 1878.

Latin Lessons. Adapted to Allen & Greenough's Grammar. Prepared by *R. F. Leighton, Ph.D.* Revised edition. Boston: Ginn & Heath. 1878.

This, in our opinion, is an excellent grammar. The order and arrangement are of the best, and the illustrations, drawn from Comparative Grammar, are, as far as we have seen, as exact as they are instructive. If the latter are meant for boys, they are likely to bewilder them; if they are meant only for teachers, why increase with them unnecessarily the bulk and price of a book intended for school-boys? We do not object to this way of studying Latin, when it is to be thoroughly studied as professional scholars should study it. Our only difficulty is that this higher knowledge seems out of place in a boy's elementary book.

We think it feasible enough that a boy should be made to learn Sanscrit first, then Greek, and then Latin; for the Sanscrit has in it the germs of the Italo-Pelasgic (Latin and Greek) no less than of the Teutonic tongues. It certainly is easier to come down thus than to go up with toilsome ascent from Latin to Greek, and from that to our common Aryan mother. The experiment would be worth trying.

Bible History; to which is added a short History of the Church. For the use of schools. By the author of *Lessons in Bible History, etc.* With the approbation of His Eminence John, Cardinal McCloskey, Archbishop of New York. New York: P. O'Shea, 37 Barclay Street, 1879.

A previous work by the author of this book, entitled *Lessons in Bible History*, and intended for colleges and academies, has met with general and warm approval from Cardinal McCloskey and other distinguished prelates, and also from the presidents and directors of many of our best-conducted colleges and academies. It fulfils so well the conditions of a textbook for those institutions, that a strong desire has been expressed by many of the clergy to have a similar textbook, but briefer, for parochial schools. In fulfilment of this desire the author has prepared the work before us.

The examination we have given it impresses us very favorably. It is in many respects a model textbook. The facts and events mentioned are judiciously selected; the narrative is consecutive and sprightly; the style simple, clear, and concise.

The Data of Ethics. By *Herbert Spencer*. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1879.

This is Mr. Spencer's last word on subjects which, under various forms, he has been discussing for a number of years. It is remarkable how many true conclusions Mr. Spencer reaches from false premises, and frequently from sophical processes of reasoning. This, however, is by no means an exceptional fact either with him or with other thinkers of his school. They live in a world which consciously or unconsciously is largely influenced by Christian faith; and unwittingly, if not contrary to their own deliberate purposes, that faith colors and shapes their thoughts, and impels them to positions which, though true in themselves, are inconsistent with the premises they have laid down, and the fallacious ratiocination they have adopted. In this respect they often "build more wisely than they know."

70737

PERIODICAL

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM